THE EIGHTH CRUSADE

UNCENSORED DISCLOSURES OF A BRITISH STAFF OFFICER

THE EIGHTH CRUSADE

UNCENSORED DISCLOSURES OF A BRITISH STAFF OFFICER

1939

INTERNATIONALER VERLAG

BERLIN W 15

FIRST EDITION AUGUST 1939
SECOND EDITION SEPTEMBER 1939

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CONTENTS

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THE EIGHTH CRUSADE

PART I	ZIONISM
CHAPTER I	HISTORY OF ZIONISM
CHAPTER II	THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR
CHAPTER III	THE DICTATE OF ZION
PART II	THE SANCTITY OF TREATIES
CHAPTER IV	THE ANGLO–SHERIFFEAN MACHINATIONS, CONSPIRACY AND SECRET TREATY
CHAPTER V	THE ANGLO–SHERIFFEAN MACHINATIONS
CHAPTER VI	THE SYKES–PICOT TREATY
CHAPTER VII	THE BALFOUR DECLARATION
CHAPTER VIII	THE ENTENTE REFUTES ITS OWN DUPLICITY
PART III	PERSONAL EXPERIENCES
CHAPTER IX	THE SECOND BATTLE OF MEGIDDO
CHAPTER X	PARIS 1919

ENDNOTES

ABOUT THIS E-BOOK

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The author, a retired and competent British Officer of high rank is fully conversant with the problems he discusses. His experience while serving in an exceptional capacity under the Foreign Office as well as the War Office afforded him a deep insight into every aspect of the situation in Palestine and the Near East. This lends greater weight to his statements which are in no way exaggerated, but are all based upon personal experience acquired from actual contact with contemporary events and from knowledge derived from a thorough examination of the facts.

The book itself sets out to prove that the Palestine "impasse" is typical of what Jewry is doing to disrupt the world, and that the secret of Jewry's power lies in the innate dishonesty of its victims. When thieves fall out the Jew comes into his own. In this book is traced step by step the intricate process which has resulted in Britain finding herself face to face with the greatest crisis in her history.

England is the victim of her own hypocrisy and her own duplicity; the victim of her foreign governess policy, specially devised to distract the attention of the British public from home affairs which are in such an appalling condition. In trying to compass the downfall of others Britain has merely succeeded in playing into the hands of the Jews. Because British public opinion has been moulded by mendacious propaganda it is the most intolerant and bigoted in the world. The English are the easiest people to govern and to misgovern because they are the easiest to turn away from any purpose and from the truth, but if they are to learn a lesson from the appalling results of the betrayal of their late Allies, the Arabs of Palestine and Syria, that lesson will be the discovery of the truth revealed in La Rochefoucauld's saying: LE VRAI MOYEN D'ÊTRE TROMPÉ C'EST DE SE CROIRE PLUS FIN QUE LES AUTRES.

The book is in three parts of which Part I depicts the history of Zionism, its origin and growth and its final triumph during the War both in Europe and America.

Part II describes European politics in the light of Zionism during and after the War, with special reference to the Anglo–Shereefian machinations, the Sykes–Picot Treaty and the Balfour Declaration.

Part III is the narrative of the author's personal experiences in Syria and Egypt during and after the War and at the Peace Conference in Paris.

The paramount accendency of the Jew in England today renders the publication of the author's identity undesirable until such time as Englishmen are free to express an opinion on the Jewish menace to their own country without being flung into prison.

London, August 1939.

THE EIGHTH CRUSADE

IN 1095 was inaugurated the first crusade which ended four years later with the capture of Jerusalem in 1099. During the neat two hundred years, six consecutive "Christian" expeditions landed in Palestine and fought with varying success for the possession of Jerusalem which was finally abandoned to the Moslems when the last crusaders sailed from Athlit in 1291. Six and a quarter centuries later Jerusalem was recaptured by the expeditionary force under General Allenby. In spite however of initial successes and in spite of Allenby's victorious campaign, this last invasion of Palestine achieved no more for Britain than did any of its predecessors for the crusaders; but whereas these latter failed because their campaigns were abortive, they themselves being defeated on the field of battle, Britain had to forego the fruits of victory because a craven and corrupt Government had mortgaged them to its paymasters, the Jews. Consequently Allenby's troops fought to their own detriment, for an alien oligarchy to whom they had been sold, and at whose behest and for whose material advantage Britain had surrendered the heritage of Empire.

The motive behind this eighth "crusade" originated over hundred years earlier, during the first decade of the XIX century, but as it constitutes the prelude to the last chapter in the history of Zionism we will return to it at the end of the narrative, and begin at the beginning.

PART I

ZIONISM

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF ZIONISM

Its Origin and Growth

THE Jewish "Community," a social order peculiar to Jewry, constitutes an unmitigated power for evil which for twenty centuries has undermined civilisation in every quarter of the globe. Immune to outside influence it has functioned according to its own arbitrary laws in defiance and to the detriment of the countries upon which its members have battened.

In the reign of Augustus Jewish political councils were formed which concealed under the cloak of religion the grasping aims of an all-powerful clique. During the siege of Jerusalem by Vespasian, this clique won the favour of the Roman conquerers and was rewarded by the Imperial Government with a Mandate for the administration of Palestine, on the strength of which the clique constituted itself a governing body with absolute powers. This Government was known as the Kahal; i. e. the Community or Commonwealth.

Wherever Jewish immigrants settled they founded "Communities," and by the end of the second century A. D. nearly every Province of the Roman Empire had at least one such Jewish colony. These "Communities" each of which was a self contained miniature Kahal, were affiliated to the central parent body upon which their existence depended. To strengthen its control and to advance Jewish interests, the Kahal developed and perfected that elaborate system of espionage and insidious subversion which it still maintains, a system which explains the concentration of power and trade in the hands of Jews wherever these have settled in sufficient numbers.

The teaching in the synagogue incited its following to a thorough exploiting of their Gentile neighbours; this doctrine, always popular with Jews, became embodied in a manual of Jewish laws drawn from the Talmud and called the Shulchan Aruk, which taught that all non-Jews were beasts of burden to be stripped of their property for the benefit of Jewry. This doctrine united the Community in a common aim and a common hatred, and was transmitted by the Shulchan Aruk from generation to generation.

The life of the Jewish rank and file has changed little through the ages; disseminated throughout the world and claiming equal rights with other nationals, they are still the tools of their hierarchy, the ruling clique; to it they pay heavy taxes and in return receive help in exploiting the land which harbours them.

In about 1770 began the movement for the emancipation of the Jews, an object which was to a large extent realised in France as a result of the Revolution. At about the same time Germany, Austria and England bestowed political freedom on their Jews, some of whom rose to high social and administrative rank. But freed by the Gentiles from the restricting influence of the ghetto, the Jews found the yoke of the Kahal irksome, and as it could no longer add anything to their material welfare they longed to be rid of its jurisdiction so as to be left in undisturbed enjoyment of their newly acquired wealth.

Accordingly the Jewish leaders, in order to create and stimulate new interests and new links between “Communities,” founded a group of so-called “universal brotherhoods,” one of which was the “Brotherhood for the Population of Palestine.”

Among various devices to which the Kahal resorted to keep its flock within the fold was the pogrom, which was never difficult to organise in Russia and Poland where the peasants, if sufficiently provoked by fraud and extortion, could generally be relied upon to retaliate by beating up and killing a few Jews; whereupon millions of their race would rally round the synagogue.

The privileges granted the Jews by Tzar Alexander II necessitated the pogrom of 1882, and these were followed by the usual cry of “anti-Semitism,” which as Herzl used to say. “Always gathered the sheep into the fold,” this time at the Conference of Kattowitz in 1884.

Here, the assimilated western Jews met their Ashkenazi kinsmen who embodied the violent Zionism of the eastern ghettoes, of which the aim was the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine, and eventual world domination. This eastern group known as “The Friends of Zion” was led by (inter alia) Leo Pinsker who had already published his programme in a book, “Auto Emancipation,” but who, prevented by fear of the Russian authorities from a full exposition of his aim, had limited himself to claiming Palestine for the Jews merely as a REFUGE AGAINST PERSECUTION. One of his colleagues however, the fanatic Asher Ginzberg carried the work much farther. He fanned Jewish national aspirations throughout the east, and from the founding of the

“Sons of Moses” in Odessa in 1889, the movement spread rapidly. Meanwhile another fanatical Zionist Nathan Birnbaum, alias Mathias Asher of Vienna, organised Jewish students into a body called the Kadimah, of which the object was to establish a Jewish “nation” in Palestine which should rule the world politically as well as in the spheres of economics and religion, through powerful wealthy Jews at the head of affairs in every Gentile nation. The western Jews who did not at first respond readily to nationalism were intrigued by this idea or world domination, and in spite of their apparent “assimilation” were eventually won over to the eastern point of view.

This western group was divided into Rothschilds and their satellites on the one hand and Jews of the U.S.A. and Germany on the other. These latter who had invested considerably in German industry pretended to espouse the cause of German political and economic development, but when in 1896 Germany acquired the Baghdad Railway concession and thereby drew Palestine into the orbit of her political influence, leading Jews of the western group in the U.S.A. and in England were alarmed at the threat to their projected acquisition of Palestine, and at once decided to baulk Germany’s interest in the Near East by uniting with the eastern group, who however would accept nothing short of their own fanatical programme as the only basis for a union. To win over the western group to the eastern view an “assimilated” Jew the notorious Theodore Herzl had published a paraphrase of Leo Pinsker’s “Auto Emancipation” which he called “The Jewish State.” There was nothing original about Herzl’s book, but after its publication the “Friends of Zion” and Nathan Birnbaum’s students’ “Kadimah” took him up. The first Zionist or Jewish World Congress was called in Basle in 1897 and Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, was elected President, a position which he held until his death in 1904. The eastern group being in the majority, the name “Zionism” coined by Nathan Birnbaum in 1886, was adopted by the Congress, the aims of which were declared to be essentially democratic. But the western group, mostly from England and France, responded coldly to Herzl’s appeal, fearing to compromise the lucrative positions and privileges they had acquired in those countries, and the suggested union was postponed, the two groups separating to rally round their respective leaders Herzl and Ginzberg. Herzl who had been negotiating with the Governments of several nations for a “legally assured home” for the Jews, and had failed to obtain a charter to found this home either in

Palestine or in the El Arish Peninsula, came to London to lay his project before the British Government. The Colonial Secretary, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, father of the present Prime Minister Mr. Neville Chamberlain, sympathised with Herzl but having no jurisdiction in Palestine offered the Jews a home in East Africa. This project of an autonomous settlement for the Jews in East Africa was accordingly (in 1903) laid before the sixth Zionist Congress who decided to consider it at the next Congress, the seventh, which eventually met in 1905 and rejected the offer by a large majority, which would have no national home but Palestine. A minority of 150 delegates left the Congress and constituted themselves a body called the I.T.O. (Jewish Territorial Organisation) under the leadership of Israel Zangwill, with the object of "procuring autonomous territory for those Jews WHO WILL NOT or cannot remain where they are!"

In September 1929 an article appeared in the *Judisk Tidskrift* by Dr. Ehrenpreis, Chief Rabbi of Sweden who said:—

"I participated in the first Zionist World Congress held at Basle in 1897. Herzl who was the most prominent figure at that Congress foresaw twenty years before we experienced them, the revolutions brought about by the Great War, and he prepared us for what was going to happen. He foresaw the splitting up of Turkey and he foresaw that England would get control of Palestine." ... We may expect important developments in the world' said Herzl twenty years before the Great War, 'and those events will offer the Jewish people fresh opportunities'."

Herzl died and his moderate party in the Zionist Congress came under the control of the violent nationalists led by Ginzberg who inculcated a new doctrine and the strength of mass fanaticism upon Jewish ambition. Ginzberg attacked Pinsker's plan for sending Jews from Russia to Palestine merely for what material avantage they might derive, and insisted that the Jews must first become aggressively national, a direct appeal to fanaticism which was well received by Jews all over Europe. In 1911 Ginzberg's associate Chaim Weizmann and others scored a victory at the tenth Zionist Congress, and after the 1913 Congress, Zionism as Ginzberg understood it, became a reality which his disciples including Weizmann, Sokoloff and Jabotinsky have since carried to victory in a Judaized Palestine. To the world as a whole the Great War caused only suffering, but to Zionism it brought the realisation of its immediate aim.

At the outbreak of war Zionism had its headquarters in Berlin where also were the headquarters of the moderate party, represented by the *Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden*, a society whose schools, seminaries and other institutions in Palestine were superior to those of the Zionists and of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*, a body which had always been particularly active in Arab countries. When in 1912 the French authorities began to take stock of the educational facilities in Morocco, they found that the only non-Islamic schools were not French or even European, but were those of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*! The Inner Actions Committee of the Zionist Congress which met regularly in Berlin and transacted all international business between Congresses, was composed of members dispersed in various countries throughout the world. During the War, the services rendered to Zionism by Dr. Schmaryar Levin in the U.S.A. were invaluable, as were those of members such as Max Warburg and Hantke who remained in Berlin throughout the War. Max Warburg, brother of Paul and Felix, associated with his brothers and Jacob Schiff in Kuhn Loeb, and Chief of the banking firm of Max Warburg & Co. of Hamburg, was one of the "German" plenipotentiaries at the Peace Conference in Paris.

The Zionist Inner Actions Committee operated from Constantinople through their agent Jacobson who sheltered under the wing of his fellow tribesman, the United States Ambassador at the Sublime Porte,[1] His Excellency "Sir" Henry Morgenthau K.B.E. Dr. of Laws: Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour, and a Member of the Greek Order of the Holy Saviour.

As the authority no less than the reason for the destruction of German Central Europe is derived almost exclusively from Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles, it behoves an impartial judge to discover the authority for the veracity of the notorious Article itself. The case for the prosecution rests on the assumption that the War "this greatest of human tragedies was started by the Kaiser and his crew (!) at the Potsdam Crown Council on July 5, 1914."

The Peace Commission, presided over by the United States Foreign Secretary Mr. Lansing, readily accepted this accusation and cited it as valuable evidence of Germany's exclusive and incontestable war-guilt, fully justifying Article 231 of the Treaty. In addition it was received and promulgated by Poincaré and most of the leading supporters of Entente ideology. The chief protagonist, if not the actual source of this pseudo-logical inexactitude was the Jew Henry Morgenthau, who in order to

make it the more acceptable actually pretended to have received it personally from Baron Wangenheim, the German Ambassador in Constantinople!

That this now legendary story was pure invention is proved by contemporary documents including Morgenthau's own dispatches to Washington, among which minute search has not revealed any reference to "what was PERHAPS the most important thing ever heard at Constantinople."

The strength of this Zionist international chain of communication did not escape the attention of the German Government, which in June 1915 sought its support in addition to that of the *Hilfsverein*. The Zionists were however too shrewd to commit themselves while the issue of the War still hung in the balance. At the same time they wanted to retain Germany's confidence, so they evaded the German Government's request with the ironical excuse that "Zionism could not be involved in world politics."

In 1916 (the date is significant) the Zionists secretly transferred their "support" from the Central Powers to the Allies, and their headquarters from Berlin to London. From then on their influence was felt more and more in political and financial circles in Europe and America. The Zionist Transfer Department was active in transmitting funds and information to subversive elements in all the belligerent countries. When Constantinople ceased to be a convenient centre for Zionist political intrigue, Jacobson left for Copenhagen where he established a Zionist Bureau for the transmission of information and funds, chiefly through his agent Chlenov, who went to and fro between Russia, Denmark, and England. Nahum Sokoloff also moved freely about the Allied countries, while Rudolf Steiner passed unhindered between Germany and England during the whole period of the War in spite of police regulations.

By its ruthless financial machinations the Transfer Department established a Zionist credit system throughout the world which was instrumental in compelling the Allied Governments to recognise the Zionist Organisation as the official representative of the Jewish people. In 1916 the chief task which engaged the Zionists was the revolution in Russia. How their agents, the Bolsheviks, manifested the power of Zionism by becoming the absolute masters of Russia is common knowledge and needs no comment. A tremendous stimulus was given

to Jewry and to Zionism in particular by this dramatic triumph of the ruthless methods advocated by Ginsberg.

While Zionism was making history in Petrograd, its members had been active in London which had become the financial centre of the Zionist Organisation; for while the Berlin banking firm of Bleichroeder Mendelssohn continued to support the moderates, the new movement, representing Ginsberg's aggressive nationalism was espoused by the firm of Rothschild, chiefly as a result of its association with Chaim Weizmann, who with Nahum Sokoloff had established a centre in London where since 1914 they had been actively engaged in Zionist propaganda.

Before that time Zionism in England had had the support of C. P. Scott Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, and Arthur J. Balfour, but boasted no other patrons of any importance until Chaim Weizmann approached Lloyd George who responded immediately and enthusiastically.

A memorandum was then presented to the Cabinet by the Home Secretary Mr. Herbert Samuel (now Lord Samuel), strongly advocating the annexation of Palestine by Great Britain with the object of settling between 3 and 4 million Jews there. But Mr. Asquith was not favourably impressed with the idea, notwithstanding that among British Cabinet Ministers were some of Jewry's principal marionettes including Edgar Speyer's fidus Achates, the Prime Minister H. H. Asquith (whose anti-Zionist pronouncements made him an ideal foil to the real motives of Zionism) and the assimilated Gentiles Lords Crewe and Curzon, of whom the former had married the grand-daughter of Meyer Amschel Rothschild, while the latter's father-in-law was the millionaire Jew, Levi Zeigler Leiter, notorious even in the *Wheat Pit* of Chicago!

Of the Jews or pro-Jews behind the Government the most powerful were the shadow Minister and *de facto* Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rufus Isaacs (Lord Reading) and the following Jewish Privy Councillors who for years had wielded supreme power in the nation's innermost Council of State.

Lord Rothschild.

Sir William Goschen.

Sir Alfred Moritz Mond (Lord Melchett).

Sir Edgar Speyer. Bart., bosom friend and mentor of the impecunious but ambitious Prime Minister H. Asquith. Director of Speyer Bros. bill-

discounters of London and New York, of which firm the other directors were:

Edward Beit von Speyer, Henry Oppenheimer, Max Bingen, James Speyer, H. Hymann and R. Isaac. Soon after the outbreak of War Edgar Speyer emigrated to New York.

Sir Ernest Cassel, King Edward VII's protégé and private banker, whose agent in Cairo Harari Pasha was a leader of Jewish financial and political activities in the Levant. Sir Ernest Cassel was Trustee of the Egyptian Government Irrigation Trust; his only co-Trustee in 1914 was A. R. Mills, (Lord Hillingdon) of Glynn Mills Currie & Co., Bankers.

Edwin Samuel Montagu (real sur-name Samuel), Secretary of State for India during Lloyd George's dictatorship.

Herbert Lewis Samuel, the notorious Postmaster General of the Marconi scandal. High Commissioner in Palestine and now Viscount Samuel.

Sir Harry Simon Samuel.

A few of the above are worthy of special mention. To contest the right of Sir Ernest Cassel and Sir Edgar Speyer to sit on the Privy Council of Great Britain a test case was taken in 1914 by Sir George Makgill, during which the Lord Chief Justice Rufus Isaacs stated that the Act of Settlement which prohibited Aliens from being Privy Councillors was "repealed by implication" by the Prime Minister Mr. Asquith on August 7, 1914, thus giving the Jews a free run of Britain's political, financial and trade secrets. Sir Ernest's fellow tribesman Felix Cassel, K.C. M.P. (naturalised in 1892) was Judge Advocate General during the Great War, and therefore the highest military legal authority and in supreme command of every Court-Martial in the British Army.

As regards the three last named Privy Councillors, the ubiquitous Samuels whose political and financial influence in England was, and still is second to none, are all members of the Jewish money-lending family of Lewis Samuel, the Liverpool pawnbroker, whose son Montagu Samuel (he assumed the sur-name of Montagu) was head of the family banking firm of Samuel Montagu and became Lord Swaythling. He was one of the principal opponents of the movement for restricting the immigration of undesirable aliens into England. He had two sons, Lewis Samuel Montagu, 2nd Baron Swaythling, head of the firm Samuel Montagu & Co., one of the most powerful international banking houses in England, whose widow Rachel, the Dowager Lady Swaythling, is

vice President of the English Speaking Union! The second son Edwin Samuel Montagu was Secretary of State for India.

The Rt. Hon. Herbert Lewis Samuel, now Viscount Samuel, G.C.B. G.B.E. etc. was chairman of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on National Expenditure in 1917 and 1918 and President of the Royal Statistical Society. He is one of the tribesmen on whom particular reliance is placed by the Jews to further their international, as opposed to British national interests.

Viscount Samuel's eldest son the Hon. Edwin Samuel was District Officer, Jerusalem and Jaffa from 1920-27, Assistant Secretary to the Government of Palestine 1927-30, and Assistant District Commissioner Galilee Division. He is now Deputy Commissioner for Migration, Government of Palestine.

Viscount Samuel's brother, the late Sir Stuart Samuel M.P. was a member of Samuel Montagu & Co. bankers, and as President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, was virtually Prime Minister of the Jewish Parliament in Great Britain which controls the Parliament at Westminster. It is an imperium in imperio, the Jewish international Parliament in the heart of the British Empire and is the inner motive power which guides the whole political machine for Jewish ends.

In 1919 this super-rich Jewish banker was appointed by the Foreign Office to represent Great Britain at the head of the Mission which was sent to Poland to investigate pogroms there! The Government's invitation to lead the Mission to Poland was first extended to Viscount Samuel, but as he was at that time representing Britain at the head of an Anglo–Belgian Mission, the choice fell on his brother Sir Stuart, who had already distinguished himself by voting in Parliament a number of times after his own firm had become Contractors to the Government, a highly reprehensible and strictly illegal procedure.

Sir Stuart Samuel was Mr. Winston Churchill's principal assistant in leading the opposition to the Aliens Immigration Measure, and was associated with Winston Churchill in the movement for procuring the abolition of the naturalisation fees. In a speech to the Jews at Leeds in 1906 Sir Stuart Samuel said:—

"Let me point out to you the necessity of getting naturalised. The Jews and other aliens if they do not possess the vote are not able to protect themselves against the laws made against them."

Apart from the Jews, one of Zion's greatest champions was, and is David Lloyd George, who became virtual Dictator of Britain from

December 1916 to October 1922, and whose Government included Arthur Balfour, while his Ministry of Munitions harboured Dr. Chaim Weizmann as well as Jewry's idol, Mr. Winston Churchill. Moreover, during the eleven months of his Dictatorship preceding the publication of the Balfour Declaration, some of Mr. Lloyd George's closest friends and confidants were:—

Rufus Isaacs (Lord Reading) and his brothers Harry and Godfrey.

Sir Alfred Mond (Lord Melchett).

Colonel Sir Maurice Hankey. G.C.B. G.C.V.O. G.C.M.G. formerly clerk to the Privy Council and Principal Secretary to the Cabinet Secretariat and Secretary to the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann.

Edwin Samuel Montagu, P.C. Secretary of State for India during Lloyd George's Dictatorship.

The Levantine-Jew Zachariou, multi-millionaire armament purveyor and international war-monger; principal shareholder in Vickers Armament Works, better known as Sir Basil Zaharoff, whom Mr. Lloyd George created a Knight Grand Cross of the Bath and of the British Empire.

Sir Hamar Greenwood, formerly Chief Secretary for Ireland, now Viscount Greenwood, chairman of many companies. A Jew and father-in-law to the Rt. Hon. Leopold C.M.S. Amery. M.P.

Leopold C.M.S. Amery. M.P., son of Elizabeth Leitner, a Jewess, and married to the daughter of Sir Hamar Greenwood. He was on the editorial staff of "The Times" 1899-1909 and M.P. 1911. At the outbreak of War he was appointed to Military Intelligence as Lieut. Col. in charge of Balkan Affairs. In 1917 he became Assistant Secretary to the War Cabinet and in 1918 was on the Staff of the Supreme Council at Versailles.

Sir Philip Sassoon, Bart., Privy Councillor and Knight Grand Cross of the British Empire, Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. Lloyd George when Prime Minister and private secretary to Field Marshal Lord Haig during the War. This latter appointment is closely connected with Lloyd George's vitriolic antipathy to Haig, but it is better explained by Isaac Blumchen's dictum in his Jewish text book *Le Droit de la Race Supérieure*, "We (the Jews) watch over the Gentiles through their Jewish secretaries."

These few names constitute a formidable array but they do not represent a tithe of that all-powerful Zionist element in the British

Cabinet and Parliament, as well as in the most influential politico-financial-industrial circles outside them, including that of Poalé Zion, the English-speaking branch of the Jewish International Labour Party, which constitutes the Communist Left Wing of the Zionist Movement, and is responsible for the Bolshevist character of the Jewish immigrants to Palestine.

By mastering the machinery of Government, of which Wall Street is the key, the Jews had risen to supreme power in the U.S. and had striven relentlessly to make that power absolute and world-wide by bringing Sterling within the jurisdiction of their Almighty Dollar. Accordingly, ever since the outbreak of war the combined forces of Jewry in the U.S. had subjected Sterling to a gruelling wearing-down process, an inexorable war of attrition which succeeded so well that by the beginning of 1916, Sterling, shorn of its gold covering, had ceased to function independently and was now purely instrumental to the Dollar, and as it had been the foundation and mainstay of the entire continental monetary system, Sterling was followed automatically into bondage by the French franc which by the irony of fate, had itself been the medium through which the Jew-ridden French Government and Bank of France had driven the Pound Sterling into the service of Zionism.

The method by which this was achieved was as simple as it was effective. New York who remained on the best of terms with London throughout, did not show her hand until the last minute. Like all Jewish measures, the financial campaign against Britain was subversive, and was conducted indirectly through France and Russia, who by their dissembling and duplicity no less than by their disreputable financial status, were instrumental in breaking the resistance of the Pound, thereby converting Bank of England notes into scraps of paper to which New York could ascribe what value it pleased.

CHAPTER II

THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR

EVER since the beginning of the Great War Britain had been steadily exporting vast quantities of gold to the U.S.A., partly to pay for purchases made there on her own account, but chiefly on behalf of her Allies. Having borne practically the whole of the Allied financial burden during the first six months of the War, the British Government was anxious to secure the participation of France in the huge advances already made by Great Britain to Belgium and Russia, and in those far greater advances which she would have to make to these and other Allies including France herself.

Accordingly in February 1915 the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George, proposed that the better to meet their common and mutual obligations the Allies should pool the gold held by the Bank of England, the Bank of France and the Imperial Bank of Russia, and that the existing proportions in their respective gold holdings should be maintained by mutual adjustment between the three Banks. This France flatly refused to do. She argued that if England was pressed as the result of excessive shipments of gold, on account of her purchases in the U.S., France too, would sooner or later have to purchase in the U.S. and would therefore also be compelled to export HER gold, and France had not the resources of Great Britain to replace the gold held by the Bank of France. But "as it seemed to France only reasonable that she should pool her financial resources with England" explained M. Alexandre Ribot, on behalf of the French Government, "we must not look only to gold to make good our purchases, our efforts must be exerted not only to putting our gold into the common cause, but also the means whereby to assure our credit abroad. Why should we not announce forthwith," continued M. Ribot, "our intention to issue an international loan in the name of the Entente? This would give to the world the most tangible proof of our solidarity, and the attractive nature of the stock pledged by the combined resources of Great Britain, France and Russia, payable in pounds, francs or roubles AT GOLD PARITY would guarantee its success."!

This was too much even for a long suffering British Government, and was rejected by Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Cunliffe (Governor of the Bank of England) on the ground that the London money market which

was the least affected by the War, would have to provide by far the greater part if not the whole of the securities, and as Britain was apprehensive of not being able to maintain the parity of Sterling in the U.S. she refused to weaken her own credit by associating it with that of her Allies. However, in spite of no little concern in London financial circles, it was agreed, AT THE SUGGESTION OF FRANCE, between Britain, France and Russia to issue a joint loan in aid of those smaller Allied countries which were not in a position to borrow in their own names; and on the strength of this the Bank of France very reluctantly undertook to advance to the Bank of England £6,000,000 in the event of the latter's gold reserve falling below £80,000,000, and finally Mr. Lloyd George succeeded in wringing from France her CONSENT to share in equal proportions with Britain the advances already made, and to be made, by the British Government to Belgium and Russia. These so-called advances (actually cash payments free of interest, totalling hundreds of million pounds) were of course never repaid, and as France repudiated all her financial obligations, the full burden of the debt was eventually shouldered by Great Britain.

By April 1915 French indebtedness to the U.S. had assumed such proportions that the British Government was concerned about France's ability to honour the debts she was contracting abroad on such a lavish and ever increasing scale. Britain was providing France with all the coal she required with so little chance of being paid for it that the manner of payment had not even been mooted. Nor had France come to any financial arrangement with the U.S.; she preferred to leave the settlement of her debts to Great Britain. The American Banks were not disposed to discount French paper and it was realised that an appeal to the American public would be useless. French credit in the English money market stood no higher than it did in New York. when in April 1915 M. Ribot arrived in London not only to ask for still further financial assistance, but to persuade the British Treasury to open fresh credits for France in the U.S.A., and as a result of Ribot's mission, France was credited in London, and with London's authority in the U.S. with a sum equivalent to three times the value of the gold to be sent as security from the Bank of France, whose gold reserve had by this time appreciated, and was now worth no less than £ 220,000,000.

Later in the same year (1915) the Jewish banker Octave Homberg, financial representative of the French Government in the U.S., created an agency in New York in order to "keep in touch with the financial

world" and incidentally "to create and seize opportunities for strengthening French resources," a procedure which entailed the gradual "education" of bankers and public. As a young man Octave Homberg had served under Delcassé in the diplomatic service where he became expert at decoding the secret telegrams despatched by foreign Ambassadors in Paris to their respective Governments, written in cyphers to which the Quai d'Orsay[2] had "found" the key! But it was as a financier that he excelled, especially in connection with Abyssinia and Russia where corruption was the order of the day. He made good use of his many acquaintances among English bankers and statesmen, for whom and for whose methods he expressed profound contempt, while evincing a marked predilection for his countryman Lord Reading.

Homberg was a Director of the South African Central Mining and Investment Corporation Ltd. with a capital of £5,100,000. His co-directors were Lionel Philips, Lewis Reyersbach and Schumacher (since changed to Ffennell). In Johannesburg this Corporation which controls the South African gold industry, is known as the "Corner House." Among Homberg's numerous business associates were Henry Strakosch, Otto Beit, Friedlander, Gustav Imroth and Sir Sigmund Neumann. He shared Delcassé's Germanophobia and was an ardent advocate of peace terms which would permanently cripple Germany.

Octave Homberg presided with marked success at his New York agency until AFTER the U.S. had entered the War.

Before the end of 1915 France was again in serious financial difficulties, a condition which was no less applicable to Great Britain, when in February 1916 Ribot once more appealed to the British Treasury to open fresh credits under conditions similar to those upon which France had obtained her previous loan in April 1915, but which she never fulfilled. In spite of her preponderant gold reserve, France's credit was very low on account of her unenviable reputation as a debtor, the franc was beginning to fall and the French public who were already clamouring, threatened to panic. So desperate was the financial position in France that in Ribot's own words:—

"We succeeded in obtaining certain assets in the U.S. by means of operations in connection" with the banking house of Kuhn Loeb (a branch of the Bleichroeder Mendelssohn Bank) which under normal conditions we could not have advised any Finance Minister to entertain ... a desperate policy by which we had recourse to every possible expedient to put off the fatal day when, in the event of the U.S. not

coming into the War, we should find ourselves without means to pay our way. It was imperative at all costs that we should go to the utmost limits and strive with might and main to gain a few months, a few weeks, even a few days."

However, M. Alexandre Ribot's financial legerdemain was as nothing compared with the more elementary methods practised quite unblushingly and with amazing success by his opposite number in Petrograd, M. Bark, with whose Government France had in 1915 opened credits for £ 25,000,000 (paying interest at the discount rates of the Bank of France) which it was stipulated were to be spent entirely in France on redeeming the Russian debt, and on orders for war material to be manufactured in France. The discrepancy between these terms and those which France demanded and received from Great Britain is, to say the least, remarkable. Having failed to obtain a renewal of this *douceur* in Paris M. Bark turned to London where in 1916 he brought off a financial coup which must be unique. Like M. Ribot he too apparently believed that "it was imperative at all costs to go to the utmost limits," for to obtain the necessary credits M. Bark went so far as to tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Reginald McKenna, that the Russian Imperial Bank could increase its issue of bills if Great Britain would open a credit IN GOLD, the gold to remain in London and to serve as a guarantee only. The statutes of the Imperial Bank, M. Bark explained, permitted such a credit to be considered as the equivalent of gold deposited in Russia! This purely fiduciary accommodation on the part of England would of course be covered by a credit of equal amount opened by the Russian Government with the British Government, it being understood that neither of the Governments would use these credits during the War, after which they would be annulled! As a result of this truly astounding proposal Mr. McKenna opened credits with M. Bark which transcended the wildest speculation in France and caused consternation even in England. However, British and French "expert economists" who not being in the secret, and seeing in official statements issued by the Imperial Russian Bank that its gold reserve was accumulating rapidly, were soon congratulating Russia on being able thus to increase her reserves, and Mr. McKenna on his prevision! When at last the storm broke over Russia it did not break over M. Bark: by that time Sir Peter Bark was comfortably and permanently installed in London.

By August 1916 England, the mainstay of the Allied edifice was approaching a financial calamity. She was overdrawn at Morgan's Bank to the extent of 110,000,000 dollars, and her own commitments in the U.S. and Canada, excluding those on account of advances to her Allies, amounted to 1,163,000,000 dollars; while 10,000,000 dollars a week barely sufficed to maintain the parity of sterling in New York. Moreover, from August 1916 to March 1917 Britain made regular monthly payments to France of £25,000,000 amounting in all to some £200,000,000.

It was estimated that the payments which Great Britain would be called upon to make to the U.S. up to April 1, 1917, both on her own account and on behalf of France, would amount to 1,500,000,000 dollars; and all the gold in the Bank of England was not enough to cover one third of that sum, partly because of the £221,000,000 in gold which had left England to pay for Allied purchases abroad no less than £126,000,000 had been provided by Britain herself, France's contribution being only £52,000,000. Worst of all, the British Government had tried to obtain a loan of 250,000,000 dollars in the U.S. and had been refused.

By the end of September 1916 the Allies were reduced to living from hand to mouth by short-term loans obtained on the gold which England held on deposit in Ottawa. They had exhausted every expedient which they hoped might put off the evil day, and were about to issue bonds of one to two months, when suddenly in November 1916 the Executive Council of the U.S. Federal Banks warned all the Federal Banks against locking up their resources in bonds which though apparently short dated would necessarily have to be constantly renewed during the War. In addition the U.S. Federal Reserve Board advised the American public to make searching enquiries before investing in loans not fully guaranteed. They pointed out that the U.S. had attained a degree of wealth and international power hitherto unknown, and this power they said, must not be compromised, for the U.S. would require every bit of it after the War. The Executive Council of Federal Banks and the Federal Reserve Board were both Jewish preserves.

The Allies capitulated at the first crack of the whip and immediately ceased to issue short-dated bonds, thus adding to their own difficulties. During the last months of 1916 and the beginning of 1917 conditions became critical. So serious was the situation that in December 1916 the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Bonar Law, and M. Ribot

together counted the days they could continue to hold out before the exchange value of the £ sterling, the sole support of the French exchange in New York, would begin to waver. But it held; and in March 1917 France was again pressing the British Treasury for a further credit of £50,000,000 which was granted on condition that the Bank of France would consign £10,000,000 in gold to London and a similar amount to Ottawa to be held in reserve, making a total of £20,000,000 as against Britain's £50,000,000. The Bank of France refused point blank; it was afraid that the French public would be disturbed at any depletion of its gold reserve, France's only asset and last hope. Such was the condition of affairs when on April 6, 1917 President Wilson declared war in the nick of time to save France and her guarantor from imminent bankruptcy and consequent disaster.

But the negotiations which culminated in Woodrow Wilson's grandiloquent declaration of war had been long, arduous and intricate. That they resulted in Britain's favour was due in no small measure to the finesse and prestige of her plenipotentiary in the U.S. Lord Reading, whose rise to power had been astounding even for a Jew.

His father Joseph Isaacs, fruit and ship broker, had three sons, Godfrey, Harry and Rufus Daniel, all of whom have figured prominently in the law courts. When in 1910 Godfrey became managing director of Marconi's Wireless Telegraph Co. Ltd., he was already a director of the Marconi International Marine Communication Co. Ltd. of the Spanish and General Wireless Trust Ltd. and of the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Companies of America and Canada.

Harry had been equally successful. With a capital outlay of only £107/10/0 he bought 4,300 sixpenny shares in the British Cellulose Co., and in conjunction with Jewish accomplices turned each sixpenny share into £14/10/0, thus making a total of £62,150 out of his original £107/10/0!

But amazing though they were, the achievements of Godfrey and Harry were eclipsed entirely by the more spectacular exploits of their brother Rufus. After miraculously escaping criminal proceedings following his youthful activities as a stockbroker, Rufus Daniel Isaacs became a lawyer and entered Parliament, thereafter his politico-legal-business career was meteoric.

On March 7, 1912 Mr. Herbert Lewis Samuel, Postmaster General (now Viscount Samuel), accepted a tender from the Marconi Company of which the managing director was Godfrey Isaacs, whose brother

Rufus was then Attorney General, chief legal adviser to Mr. Asquith's Government. The sequel was the notorious gamble in Marconi shares. Upon the acceptance of his tender by the Postmaster General, Godfrey Isaacs went to the U.S.A. and returned at the peak of the boom (resulting from the Samuel-Godfrey Isaacs deal) with 100,000 American Marconi shares in his pocket, while in those of his jobber Mr. Heybourne were over double that number, all of which Godfrey intended to place on the London market. Before doing so however he summoned his brothers Harry and Rufus, the Attorney General, to a private meeting and offered them the shares at £1/16/0 each, at which price Harry took 56,000 and of these Rufus subsequently bought from Harry 10,000 at £2 each.

Later both Mr. Lloyd George (who as Chancellor of the Exchequer had provided the Postmaster General (Herbert Samuel) with the money wherewith to pay for Godfrey Isaac's tender) and the Master of Elibank M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury and Controller of the secret Liberal Party Funds, shared in the transaction.

In April 1912 the English Market opened at £3/5/0 per share, a figure never since touched. Godfrey and Harry Isaacs and Messrs. Lloyd George and Elibank sold nearly all their shares at an enormous profit. In addition Elibank invested some of the secret Party Funds in the swindle, and a month later he and Lloyd George had another private flutter on their own.

In July 1912 the contract between Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster General and Godfrey Isaacs, Managing Director of Marconi's Wireless Co., had to come before the House of Commons for ratification. The Attorney General Rufus Daniel Isaacs, the Chancellor of the Exchequer Lloyd George, and Elibank, Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury and Controller of the secret Party Funds were all three financially interested in American Marconi's on highly advantageous terms, and aided by Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster General, they made strenuous efforts to rush the matter through Parliament on the last night of the Session, and would have succeeded but for Major Archer Shee.

On October 11, Parliament reassembled and a fierce debate on the Samuel-Isaacs Wireless contract took place. Both Rufus Isaacs and Herbert Samuel strongly denied that they or any of their colleagues had ever held a share in "this Company," whilst Lloyd George talked vaguely of slander and "foul lips." When eventually a committee was appointed to investigate the scandal, Rufus Isaacs himself approached

two of its members and privately informed them of his dealings in Marconis and those of the other Ministers, not from any altruistic or honourable motive but “because” as Rufus himself admitted on oath, “the Committee were going to examine the journalists” who had made the disclosures and who were in possession of all the incriminating evidence. Faced with a crisis and fearing for their own safety, the Government instructed the Committee to drop the matter and to whitewash the culprits. This done, the whole affair was soon forgotten. For his complicity in the manipulation of American Marconi shares the Attorney General narrowly eluded retributive justice, but immediately after the exposure, to the consternation of all but closest friends, Mr. Asquith appointed Rufus Isaacs Lord Chief Justice of England; and two months later created him Baron Reading of Erleigh! In June 1915 he became a Knight Grand Cross of the Bath and a year later was made a Viscount. His greatest triumph came early in 1917 when the Entente financial crisis was nearing its climax, and Rufus Daniel Isaacs was selected out of all the King Emperor’s subjects to represent the world’s greatest Empire at the bar of Mammon in America, where he prevailed upon Zion to bring down the U.S. on the British side of the fence. In the same year Isaacs was elevated to an Earldom and two months later was appointed Great Britain’s Ambassador Extraordinary to the U.S.A. Subsequently he was created Marquess of Reading and received the Grand Crosses of the Star of India, the Indian Empire and the Royal Victorian Order. By setting their sharpest Jew to catch his brethren in the U.S.A. the British Government had evinced that innate business acumen which so often passes for political science, but the wisdom of which was not in this case substantiated by subsequent events.

With Rufus Isaacs at the head of her Financial Mission to the U.S.A., Great Britain may have been spared a “disaster” similar to that from which she was saved (according to Mr. McKenna in the House of Commons in November 1914) by the hurried naturalisation within a few days of the outbreak of War, of Baron Schroeder and his partner Julius Rittershausen. But the real disaster came with the subsequent tightening of the naturalised Schroeder’s financial control over Britain’s leading politicians:

When Daniel Reading entered the Lion’s den he found himself among compatriots, including his brother Privy Councillors Sir Ernest Cassel and Sir Edgar Speyer, eager to welcome a kindred spirit whose reputation had preceded him. The result was a foregone conclusion.

According to an official statement by Police Commissioner General Bingham, fifty per cent of the criminals in New York City were Jews, and those of his countrymen with whom Lord Reading consorted, although many of them affected to despise Zionism as a product of the ghetto, were in reality typical of the Jews throughout the U.S.A. New York had its Kahal or Community with an advisory council of Elders which "made its voice heard and its opinions felt in all questions affecting Jewry the world over."

So great was the influence exerted by Jews holding high office in the Wilson Government, both on the chief executive and on members of Congress, that the national policy of the U.S.A. was virtually controlled by Jews, amongst the most powerful of whom were the Zionist Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and President of the Zionist Association of America. He was closely associated with President Wilson, by whom he was invariably consulted on all matters relating to War Finance, and was on intimate terms with the British Financial Commission to the U.S., headed by Rufus Daniel Isaacs, Lord Chief Justice of England.

Also, Bernard Mannes Baruch, a member of the New York Stock Exchange whom President Wilson appointed to the Advisory Committee on National Defence and Chairman of the War Industries Board, controlling raw materials, minerals and metals as well as every kind of manufacture.

As a member of the Committee in charge of all purchases on behalf of the Allies in the U.S. he too was in close touch with Isaacs' Financial Commission. Baruch stated publicly that in his official capacity during the War he "probably exercised more power than any other man in the country."

Working hand in glove with the Jewish financial dictators were Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labour, and the brothers Isidore, Nathan and Oscar Salomon Strauss, the latter one time U.S. Ambassador to Turkey and a member of Theodore Roosevelt's Cabinet.

Also Julius Klein of the Department of Commerce, and Eugen Meyer, head of the Federal Reserve Board, with his two principal associates Felix and Paul Warburg, brothers of Max Warburg, the Zionist Inner Actions Committee's agent in Berlin. The Warburg's were related to and associated with Jacob Schiff in Kuhn Loeb & Co. Paul had a controlling influence in the Executive Council of the U.S. Federal Banks

and it was he who was responsible for the famous circular recommending the American Banks to cease lending money to the Allies. President Wilson appointed Paul Warburg to be a Director of the Committee charged with reforming the banking system of America.

Under growing Zionist influence the “assimilated” American Jewish Committee was superseded by the more powerful American Zionist Congress. During 1917 while this Congress was not sitting, Jewish affairs were conducted by the international Inner Actions Committee under Dr. Schmaryar Levin and by the Greater Actions Committee, two executive bodies elected by the American Zionist Congress.

As a result of intense propaganda Zionism won over the masses and most of the leaders of American Jewry, including the notorious President of Kuhn Loeb, Jacob Schiff himself, who since 1905 had been an active financial supporter of the Russian revolution, the “blessings” of which had convinced him of the efficacy of Zionism.

Schiff was the greatest financial supporter of the “German” Jews’ Mutual Aid Society, and during the War, before America intervened, he and his colleague Heubsch formed the American Neutral Conference Committee which aimed at coercing the belligerents to make peace on Jewish terms. It was this Committee which spread the idea of a League of Nations of which the nominal centre was to be Geneva, but its real centre was of course already firmly established in the home of international finance, under whose régime of international control all the nations would be welded into one vast servile state. The British King-Emperor’s Ambassador to the U.S.A. was indeed the right man in the right place. Lord Reading was in his element.

CHAPTER III

THE DICTATE OF ZION

THE War was not a year old before responsible Allied statesmen were casting anxious glances not eastwards towards the front, but westward over the Atlantic whence threatened dangers infinitely worse than anything discernible on the battlefields. The Entente was insolvent, it could not hope to discharge even a tithe of its debt; all its assets were mortgaged to the U.S. and Britain's gold reserve was exhausted. As it became increasingly obvious that the War would be won or lost in New York, so did the Allies concentrate as much if not more upon gaining the support of Jewdom in the U.S. than on winning battles in Europe. To escape the impending calamity the Entente and its creditors had to convince the U.S. not only of the urgent necessity, but of the advantages of coming into the War. The Banks and Big Business knew, indeed none better, that bankruptcy would force the Allies to follow Russia into oblivion, and that in order to retain their investments in Europe, the Jews would have to get America to fight for them. On the other hand the public was not so minded. They had been piling up riches beyond their wildest dreams, in blissful ignorance of the true state of affairs and would certainly resist any measures which threatened to curtail their prosperity. It was equally certain moreover that President Woodrow Wilson and his Government who depended as much on public opinion as on the Banks, would not run the risk of making an unpopular move. Before they could be drawn into war the naturally emotional Yankees would have to be persuaded that they were going to fight for the liberty of small nations, for self determination, to make the world safe for democracy, and finally to end war. Accordingly the U.S. Government stipulated that America's entry into the War should be conditional upon a declaration by the Allies that these objects constituted their only motive for prosecuting the War to its conclusion, and not being in a position to dispute it, the Entente accepted President Wilson's definition of their aims without demur. France who had maintained a safe position to leeward of her Ally was not seriously affected by these stipulations, but by accepting them, Great Britain definitely abjured her political independence and by renouncing her title to the only prize that would have made her

sacrifices in the War worth while, she sowed the seed of which the fruit now threatens to disrupt the Empire. But there was no alternative.

The U.S. had been induced to declare war to "make the world safe for democracy" not to add 900,000 square miles to the British Empire. On the other hand Great Britain had not staked her very existence on the successful issue of the War for purely altruistic motives. Most important of all was the acquisition of the Sultan's dominions in Asia, vast areas stretching from Egypt to the Persian Gulf, the possession of which assures a paramount position in the Eastern Mediterranean commanding Britain's principal strategic highway, the overland, short-sea and air routes to India. Of vital importance too were the Mesopotamian oil fields, some of the richest in the world. All these and more, were the coveted prizes for which the British Empire was engaged in a desperate life and death struggle, for which she had already sacrificed so much, and must inevitably sacrifice a great deal more. How was she to reconcile her real and immutable war-aims with the purely visionary Wilsonian platitudes to which she was irrevocably committed, and on the strength of her subscription to which, the U.S. had declared war?

There was only one solution to that problem, namely dissimulation, in the form prescribed by the Zionists by whom the impasse in which Britain now found herself had been purposely created in order to provide their solution for it with a *raison d'être*. The crisis was not therefore the result of circumstances occasioned by the War, but had been deliberately and laboriously engineered as a means to an end by the Zionists, whose Political Committee had previously devised the remedy in anticipation of that crisis, and had held it in readiness until circumstances should enable them to make it effective; and "circumstances" in the shape of the Entente financial crisis, were now highly propitious.

As the absorption by the British Empire of nearly a million square miles of conquered territory would have been incompatible with her renunciation of all territorial claims after a war waged purely for disinterested motives, it had been essential to find a cloak under which Britain could satisfy her territorial aspirations unsuspected by Yankee public opinion. Accordingly Jewry foisted its mandatory system of Government upon a war-weary and bankrupt world, a system which had been evolved by the Zionists in anticipation of the crisis and to which the League of Nations subsequently gave official status and an

appearance of legality. The Mandate operates through the League of Nations of which the constitution renders it unassailable and enables it to err with impunity. It is in fact a projection of the limited liability company. Despite its comprehensive designation, however, the League of Nations consisted, at the time of the San Remo Conference, of the Supreme Council, composed of plenipotentiaries from France, Great Britain and Italy (under the tutelage of their Jewish creditors) supported by a Greek chorus of lesser debtor nations held in political and economic subservience by a patchwork of threats, pacts and loans. Under the Mandatory system (a form of expropriation by proxy) all confiscated ex-enemy territory is held in trust by the League from whom its members receive Mandates to administer as trustees ("under League supervision and solely in the interests of the inhabitants") countries where but for this magnanimous system, they would govern as conquerers. Thus by avoiding all semblance of rightful possession and arbitrary government, the Mandatary is disguised as the warden of oppressed and backward people to whom the League, through its deputy, brings a full measure of prosperity, and in time, complete independence. But Britain's were not the only aspirations concealed by that political subterfuge.

In order to enjoy complete diplomatic immunity for its international machinations, Jewry required its own particular stronghold in the guise of a Jewish National Home, possessing the full status of absolute sovereignty. But like everything Jewish, the so-called National Home was to be parasitical; it too was to thrive on the backs of others at another's expense, not however primarily for financial or economic reasons. The Jews had no intention of providing the necessary troops, administrative machinery or money, or incidentally of facing the odium which they fully realised their intrusion on Palestine would inevitably incite. So much is obvious. But they had other and weightier motives for avoiding the responsibilities of direct ownership.

The one thing that Jewry was determined to avoid was a genuine National Home, for if Zion were made a nation its nationals would automatically forfeit their cosmopolitanism to become Palestinians or natives in Palestine, and therefore aliens elsewhere. By ceasing to be members of their privileged international guild enjoying universal citizenship, the Jews would be subject to conditions similar to those governing the people of every nation in the world (excepting their own) and Jewry would have lost its *raison d'être*.

The better to convince the world of the harmless nature of their "purely patriotic and religious movement" the Zionists organised a vociferous opposition which made a great show both in the U.S. and in England of its hostility to the establishment of a Jewish State, and a campaign was launched by influential sections of Anglo–Jewry led by the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Anglo–Jewish Association the professed object of which was to dissuade the British Government from acceding to Zionist demands. The ostentatious anti-Zionism of these bodies was voiced in the British Cabinet by the Secretary of State for India, the Jew Edwin Samuel Montagu.

Although the anti-Zionist campaign was, in the main, a hoax specially devised to give Zionism the appearance of a relatively insignificant Jewish factional movement, by magnifying and stressing the rift between Zionist and anti-Zionist, such a rift did undoubtedly exist, and was caused by the genuine hostility to Zionism of the Assimilated Western Jews who affected to despise their poor relations from the ghettoes of eastern Europe, but whose animosity was prompted by nothing so much as the fear that the creation of a Jewish State would inevitably confer Jewish nationality on all Jews who would thereby forfeit their very birthright, that age-old monopoly and inestimable privilege, the secret of Juda's power, to wit, Internationalism. "The Times" of May 24, 1917 published a statement by David Alexander, President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and Claud Goldschmidt Montefiore, President of the Anglo–Jewish Association, protesting vehemently against the establishment in Palestine of independent Jewish Sovereignty which they feared would "have the effect throughout the world of stamping the Jews as strangers in THEIR NATIVE LANDS, and of undermining their HARD WON POSITION AS CITIZENS AND NATIONALS of those lands."

However, their fears were groundless, and the anti-Zionists both in England and the U.S. were quickly "won over" when they realised that Zionism's Sovereign State was only a political smoke screen.

When in 1918 opposition to Zionism came to a head in the United States it found all the leading Jews either only nominally anti-Zionist or openly favourable.

In New York on September 26, 1918 Louis Marshall wrote to the anti-Zionist Max Senior, "My reasons for supporting Zionism have been emphasised by the rapid march of events. The Allied armies have now swept the Turks and Germans out of Palestine. It is significant that

Jewish units constitute a part of the victorious army. President Wilson has expressed his approval of the principles laid down in the Balfour Declaration, and the Allied Powers are unanimously in favour of it. The American Jewish Committee recognised the political importance of the Balfour Declaration as a factor in the efforts to defeat the Central Powers. Major Lionel de Rothschild states that the League for British Jews of which he is president, is in agreement with the American Jewish Committee.

The Balfour Declaration with its acceptance by the Powers is an act of the highest diplomacy. It means BOTH MORE AND LESS than appears on the surface; FOR ZIONISM IS BUT AN INCIDENT OF A FAR-REACHING PLAN: IT IS MERELY A CONVENIENT PEG ON WHICH TO HANG A POWERFUL WEAPON."

The writer of the above, Louis Marshall, became partner in the solicitors firm Guggenheimer, Untermyer & Marshall and was appointed in 1908 chairman of the New York State Immigration Commission. For twenty years he was chairman of the Commission on Amendment of the New York Bar Association. He influenced President Taft and the Senate to abrogate the treaty with Russia on account of the persecution of the Jews in Russia, and was President of the Jewish delegation at the Peace Conference. He took a prominent part in the Zionist movement and headed the American–Jewish relief commission which raised 75,000,000 dollars "FOR JEWISH WAR SUFFERERS"!!

The whole essence of Jewish policy was that Palestine should enjoy the status of absolute sovereignty *de facto* but not *de jure* hence the insistance on a Mandate for Great Britain, who having disavowed all strategic and Imperialistic motives was, we were assured, actuated solely by a sense of duty to the League of Nations. The question of Mandates for the German possessions in Africa and Australasia which was straightforward and devoid of any particular interest aroused no comment, but the opposite was the case with regard to Palestine which enjoyed a monopoly of the political limelight. The realisation of a National Home for the Jews was represented by Jewish propaganda as a manifestation of the will of Jehovah who had inaugurated the millennium with Israel's return to the Promised Land under the auspices of the English-speaking branch of God's chosen people! a notion which was particularly widespread in the U.S. and no less popular in England though for totally different reasons.

"Get behind Jehovah's plan for Zion," said Jewry to Britain, "and you shall have your naval base and the oil wells at Kirkuk with the pipe-line to Haifa as well as the high road to India and the Key to Egypt. For ourselves we ask nothing more than to be allowed to live peaceably in our National Home." In the Palestine Mandate Great Britain saw a perfect "get out" and jumped at it, but when she deputed her impeccable Balfour to endorse the ambiguous and noncommittal Declaration which bears his name, she had reckoned without her host. *Le vrai moyen d'être trompé* said La Rochefoucauld, *c'est de se croire plus fin que les autres*.[3] Balfour signed for Britain on the dotted line of a blank cheque which can never be honoured, and on the strength of which the holders have been blackmailing the drawer ever since.

Then came the Peace Conference and the inauguration at Geneva of the League of Nations, which according to Sampter Guide to Zionism, p. 21. "is an old Jewish idea," as also is the British Mandate for Palestine over which the Jews exercise absolute control, leaving to Britain the entire cost of administration, including the construction of roads, railways and docks, the upkeep of an adequate police force, and worst of all, the maintenance of an army of occupation amounting now to no less than 18 battalions, 2 cavalry regiments and artillery, plus auxillary troops and armoured cars. Having achieved their object Jewry engineered the abdication of Woodrow Wilson and the withdrawal of the U.S. who repudiated all its commitments, leaving England and France to bear the full responsibility and odium of collecting Zion's pound of flesh in the shape of "reparations" from Germany which on the former gold basis of sterling and not including the value of the lost colonies, amounted to no less than £2,400,000,000.

* * *

The foregoing chapters constitute an introductory and explanatory background essential to the proper understanding of contemporary Near Eastern history, and without which the critical situation in Palestine would be totally inexplicable.

The following is a cursory exposition of the circumstances and events which have moulded British policy in the Levant, and of which the present crisis in Palestine is the inevitable result.

Three basic events together constitute the foundation upon which were erected the modern states which succeeded the Padisha's Asiatic

Provinces, as well as the framework within which those states have developed into what they are today. Taken not in order of their importance but chronologically, the three events are:—

1. The Anglo–Sheriffean machinations, conspiracy and Secret Treaty, resulting in the recognition and declaration by Britain of Arab Independence.
2. a. The Secret Treaty of London 1915.
   b. The Anglo–Franco–Russian “Sykes–Picot” Secret Treaty.
3. The Anglo–Jewish Secret Treaty and Balfour Declaration.

Each of these three conventions is fundamentally contradictory and diametrically opposed to the other two. All are positive negations or cancellations of one another so that the very existence of more than one of them at a time is an absurdity, and it was inevitable that the attempt to harmonise three such discordant policies should produce political cacophony. Moreover, reconciliation between the three treaties was never contemplated. They were initiated and developed in close secrecy and at long intervals. None of those whose interests were affected by any particular treaty suspected the existence of its predecessor, and all three were treacherously conceived and mendaciously sustained. There is nothing original about them. They have their counterparts in the office of every fraudulent company promoter whose first swindle he attempts to cover with a second which in turn necessitates a third, and so on indefinitely, until finally he is overpowered and brought to book by the recoil of his own duplicity.

The situation in the Near East is critical because it is chaotic, and it is chaotic because the policy which it expresses rests upon three fundamentally contradictory basic principles; it is therefore divided against itself and cannot stand, but it will have loosed hell upon earth before it falls.

PART II

THE SANCTITY OF TREATIES

CHAPTER IV

THE ANGLO–SHERIFFEAN MACHINATIONS, CONSPIRACY AND SECRET TREATY

EARLY a century ago an Arab “Nationalist Society” started in Beirut by a handful of local *literati* stiffened by an admixture of alien flotsam and jetsum, some of it from as far afield as the U.S.A. and similar fellowships sprang up in every centre throughout Syria. Though each was cast in a local mould, all were united by a common grievance, for they were essentially “agin the Government.” These little bands flourished in the heyday of café-politics during the spacious decline and fall of Abdul Hamid, and having survived the Young Turk racket were still plotting over coffee and cigarettes when War broke out.

This so-called “Arab National Movement” which was not a movement and was national only in name, is not the ancestor of the Arab National Movement now nearing its climax in Palestine and elsewhere, but merely its chronological predecessor. The former expressed the frothings of youthful effendis, irredentist hurrah-patriots and other intransigent elements, which in the hands of professional agitators might have turned every Syrian Vilayet into a Turkish Ireland, while the latter heralds a general awakening of racial and national consciousness throughout the Arab-speaking provinces of the late Ottoman Empire.

The true story of the Arab revolt will probably never be told. There will remain a variety of highly coloured “authentic” versions, varying substantially according to the predilections of their respective authors. There are two sides to every question; this one has at least three, of which two, (the English points of view) are opposite. The first depicts “Colonel” Lawrence as the traditional Hollywood super-Sheik or Arabian Lohengrin leading the “Arab Army” to victory against the flower of the Ottoman legions, with Allenby’s troops giving official status and a certain amount of tone to the somewhat unorthodox proceedings, while the other, is Allenby *et praeteria nihil* ["and nothing else"], with Lawrence’s scallywags running behind damn them! The Arab version does not concur with either of these extremes although it stresses the rout of the Turkish Armies by the Arabs, but under their own leaders *bien entendu* ["of course"].

In addition there are the official British, French and Italian histories with as many versions of the parts played in the campaign by their

respective contingents, as well as German, Turkish and neutral accounts, both official and unofficial. But if in the course of time bias and loose verbiage have distorted the history of the Syrian campaign itself, what chance has its infinitely more complicated and tortuous political offspring of being understood? Nearly a quarter of a century has elapsed since the inception of the Anglo–Arab *imbroglio* which originated in obscure and doubtful circumstances, and which an accumulated mass of misrepresentation has rendered practically unintelligible. The Anglo–Arab problem in its present form is insoluble. There is no way out of the impasse because the principles governing the relations between the British Government and the Palestine Arabs are fundamentally wrong, and wrongs such as these cannot be righted by political verbiage or by suppression.

The first official political move came not from Mecca but from London, and was prompted by the instinct of self preservation which automatically created in the British Government an overwhelming desire to defeat the Turk AT ALL COSTS, three words which explain the otherwise totally inexplicable attitude maintained during the past 23 years by Great Britain with regard to the Near East generally and to Palestine in particular. Although *casus necessitatis* ["right of necessity"] is the gist of every plea which seeks to extenuate crime, and such a pretext may under certain circumstances succeed in mitigating punishment, it deceives no one and is never a justification, but only an admission that those whom the Devil drives are indeed his own. To plead *force majeure* is to admit defeat, a thing which no responsible Government can do with impunity, and the Grandmother of Parliaments knows better than to rush in where even felons fear to tread.

The British Government has no need to justify or to explain away the successive frauds which culminated in the Balfour Declaration; its legal advisers see to that. By rigidly adhering to the letter of the law, their correspondence hedged round with legal quibbles, every statement dexterously charged or eviscerated by manipulative phraseology, the Government effectively provided against any untoward contingency long before they committed their political crimes. As regards their dealings with the Arabs, the Government are safeguarded not by anything they have said, or by what they have undertaken to do or not to do, but on the contrary by those very essentials which they have so studiously omitted to mention at all, and nowhere are essential particulars more conspicuous by their absence than in the so-called

McMahon letters, of which the following summary reveals the true nature.

* * *

There was nothing abnormal about the Anglo–Arab *pourparlers* [preliminary negotiations]. Their worst features were characteristic of orthodox diplomacy, the callous contempt of which for the supposed sanctity and inviolability of treaties is nowhere more eloquently expressed than in the actions of its leading exponents. However, the fact that there is no honour among political bagmen does not explain the incredible lack of professional skill evinced by Entente treaty-mongers in the preparation and execution of plots which, as is clearly shown in the following *résumé*, were as remarkable for their aboriginal crudity as for their duplicity.

Between August 1914 and April 1915 the Entente had made desperate efforts, with prodigal cash payments and no less extravagant promises, to bring Italy into the War on their side; and these efforts culminated with Convention of London, concluded in April 1915 between England, France and Italy, by the secret clauses of which the three Powers decided upon an equitable division of the spoils of war. This secret treaty was the determining factor which brought Italy into the War a month later. Under its terms Italy was promised (besides the Trentino, Trieste, Dalmatia, Albania with Valona, etc.) practically the whole maritime region of Asia Minor south of Smyrna including the entire Province of Adalia.

Just over a year later, on May 16, 1916 a secret convention was concluded between England, France and Russia, known as the Sykes–Picot treaty under the terms of which the whole of Syria, Irak and considerable portions of Anatolia were divided between Great Britain and France who, now that Italy, their partner of the year before, was no longer a source of anxiety, decided to keep her out and the spoils to themselves!

A year later in March 1917, the Emperor Charles of Austria made peace overtures to France and through France to Britain, but not to Italy whom he had studiously ignored. On April 11, 1917 the French Premier Alexandre Ribot divulged the Emperor's secret *démarche* to Mr. Lloyd George, who insisted that Italy's Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Jew Sonnino should be made a party to the deal. In his letter the Emperor

declared himself prepared to surrender the Italian-speaking Trentino but no more, and it was evident that to ask him to give up Trieste (already promised to Italy in 1915 at the Convention of London) would be to wreck the peace *pourparlers*. On the other hand Italy, according to Ribot, would prove equally obdurate, but Mr. Lloyd George knew better. So anxious was he to seize this spectacular opportunity that he succeeded in persuading himself, though not his French colleague, that it would only be necessary to acquaint Sonnino with the facts for him to forego Italy's claims to Trieste and to resign. Any obstinacy on Sonnino's part would be overcome it was thought by offering him Smyrna instead of Trieste. Accordingly a Conference was held on April 9, 1917 at St. Jean de Maurienne, between Lloyd George, Ribot, Sonnino and the Italian Premier Boselli, as well as the French Ambassador in Rome, Barrére. A tense atmosphere engendered by mutual suspicion pervaded the assembly, of which the mood was that of a poker party in which each player suspects the other of having at least one card up his sleeve; and not without good reason. Only Mr. Lloyd knew what had transpired at his recent secret meeting in Paris with the Emperor Charles' emissary, but despite his diplomatic armoury the British Prime Minister was completely out-manoeuvred and outgunned by the Italians who came to the conference riding very high horses, to dominate the situation from beginning to end.

Italy greatly resented the slight implied by the Entente's omission to invite her to participate at the Sykes–Picot treaty between England, France and Russia, especially as at the time Italy was herself a member of the Entente! The official excuse for not having invited her, had been that at the date when the treaty was signed i. e. May 16, 1916, Italy had not declared war against Germany as she had undertaken to do, and did not do so until August 27, i. e. three months later. As compensation for the slight and to indemnify her for the loss of what she considered were her rightful perquisites in Syria, Italy had been claiming Smyrna with such insistance that Mr. Lloyd George decided to give her satisfaction, a decision which remained a closely guarded secret between the French and British inner Cabinets, until, just before the conference at St. Jean de Maurienne, a leakage resulting from an "indiscretion" on the part of a French Cabinet Minister, had enabled the Italian Ambassador in Paris to apprise Boselli and Sonnino of the Entente's decision to abandon Smyrna to Italy in

compensation for having stolen a march on her at the Sykes–Picot treaty.

Sonnino fore-armed with this information had no difficulty in bringing Lloyd George and Ribot to confirm it. Indeed, without a word of warning Mr. Lloyd George drew from his dispatch-case a map whereon was clearly marked the zone which Great Britain had agreed to recognise as belonging to Italy, an unexpected move which took Ribot completely off his guard as he was unaware of the existence of such a map. However, it was Lloyd George's turn to look foolish when his conjuring trick was eclipsed by Sonnino who produced from his portfolio yet another map obtained from the British Foreign Office, which did not bestow Smyrna upon Italy but gave her other favourable areas not conceded on Mr. Lloyd George's map. Sonnino rose to the occasion. "I will take from the two maps" he solemnly announced, "what is advantageous to my country in each." And he further demanded that the circle traced round Smyrna on Mr. Lloyd George's map should be widened considerably. Ribot only intervened to protest that Mersina, which had been allotted to France the year before under the Sykes–Picot Convention, had been included now in the Italian zone, and Sonnino did not insist.

But Lloyd George and Ribot had gone to St. Jean de Maurienne in order to offer Smyrna to Sonnino not gratuitously but in consideration of his abandoning Trieste, and now Smyrna had been ceded to Italy without a struggle and unconditionally! Lloyd George on whose initiative the Conference had taken place, had met more than his match, and was at a loss to know how to broach the all-important question, so Ribot tackled Sonnino regarding the policy which the Entente might find it expedient to adopt in the event of Austria making peace proposals.

Ribot had hardly put the question when Sonnino flared up and declared most emphatically that to ask him to give up anything conceded to Italy by the Convention of London was tantamount to asking him to resign and the King of Italy to abdicate. "We have embarked Italy in the War" he protested vigorously "when she could have obtained most of what had been promised at the Convention of London merely by remaining neutral. We should never be forgiven for sacrificing anything of what has been guaranteed us."

Mr. Lloyd George was completely silenced and the conference came to nothing, for the Emperor Charles's peace offer was never mentioned. Sonnino's case which was unanswerable, bore a striking analogy to

that of King Hussein, but whereas Sonnino knew how to threaten with effect, Hussein's harmless protests were unavailing.

To summarise this remarkable series of events:— Italy the partner of April 1915, flattered and cajoled by the Entente while her collaboration was eagerly sought, is no sooner safely landed in the Allied net than she is overlooked and deliberately excluded from the Anglo–Franco–Russian Sykes–Picot treaty of 1916. And now in less than a year Russia, no longer able to bargain effectively, is left out of the Anglo–Franco–Italian conspiracy at St. Jean de Maurienne in 1917!

On returning to Paris, Ribot on behalf of the Entente was careful to make similar excuses to Milioukoff, the Russian Minister for foreign affairs, as had been made to Italy with regard to her exclusion from the Sykes–Picot treaty of 1916. Ribot assured Milioukoff that Russia's interests had been kept in mind and that nothing definite would be done without her. Milioukoff, who knew the value of such assurances, was considerably annoyed and made it clear that Russia would not consent to the acquisition of Smyrna by Italy; whereupon Sonnino demanded that England, France and Italy should conclude a tri-partite agreement about Smyrna without Russia as had been done a year earlier (in May 1916) by England, France and Russia without Italy. This France refused to do, and Sonnino then suggested to the French Ambassador in Rome that the problem of Smyrna should be dealt with as an integral part of the Greek question, but dropped the matter when Ribot protested.

Thereafter the fate of Smyrna hung in the balance until Sonnino made a complete *volte-face*, and "disposed" of the city to Mr. Lloyd George who, with the consent of France, immediately passed it on to M. Venizelos. This led to its occupation by a Greek army under King Constantine, who incited and backed by Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Basil Zaharoff, went on to invade Anatolia, whence he was promptly and ignominiously ejected by Mustapha Pasha Kemal, and during the headlong flight of the Greeks, Smyrna was fired and completely gutted.

Thus did Lloyd George meet his Waterloo, for although France had appeared to connive at the occupation of Smyrna by the Greek expeditionary force, she was in reality backing Turkey to compass the downfall of her *bête noire*, Mr. Lloyd George. In 1921 the French Minister Franklin-Bouillon, ardent chauvinist and Anglophobe made an "aside" treaty with Mustapha Kemal whereby the Turkish Army was entirely re-equipped and re-armed by France with the result that a year

later the Greeks were driven out of Asia Minor, and simultaneously Lloyd George was ejected from Downing Street by order of the Carlton Club conspirators.

Thus did the leading statesmen of the Great Democracies evince their respect for the sanctity of treaties, for those inviolable principles of honourable dealing between civilised Christian nations; and for those high ideals, the attainments of which as a result of an Entente victory, was to make the world safe for Democracy!

With this unavoidably lengthy digression to illustrate the moral standards governing the political tenets of "Democratic Christian civilisation," we can proceed with the Anglo–Arab *pourparlers*, the trend and purport of which become manifestly clear when examined in the sordid atmosphere of their natural surroundings.

* * *

In February 1914 the Emir Hussein, Grand Shereef of Mecca, deputed his son Abdullah to call upon Lord Kitchener in Cairo in order to ascertain what England would do if the Hejazi Arabs were to rise against the Turks. Kitchener replied at once that under no circumstances would England intervene in any dispute between the Porte [Ottoman government] and the Hejaz.

At the end of September 1914, six weeks before Britain and Turkey were at war, Kitchener now Minister for War in Asquith's Cabinet, made a similar *démarche* to that made by Hussein seven months earlier. He instructed the British Agency in Cairo to find out from Abdullah whether, if Turkey entered the War as Germany's ally, his father the Grand Shereef, would throw in his lot with Turkey or with Great Britain. Both these moves which were purely tentative, elicited similar replies. Hussein for whom there was no middle course, was faced with two alternatives, either to stand by the Sultan and by winning his confidence and gratitude reap a just reward, or to rise in rebellion and fight for the sovereign independence of the Hejaz and possibly other Arab States, or perish in the attempt. There could be no half measures.

Hussein's counsellors, his sons Feisal and Abdullah, were of opposite minds. Feisal was strongly in favour of loyalty to the Padisha. He expressed profound mistrust of western political intrigue and felt certain that France had designs on Syria and England on

Mesopotamia. Moreover, he knew that he who would sup with the Entente requires the devil of a long spoon, and this the Arabs lacked. Besides Kitchener's enquiry was after all only an enquiry, and even had they wished to rise in open rebellion against Turkey (and there was no reason to suppose that they did) the Arabs were in no condition to do go.

On the other hand Abdullah, a member of the "Young Arab" secret society strongly believed in the revolutionary zeal behind the Arab Nationalist movement and advised his father not to reject but to follow up Kitchener's questionnaire in order to ascertain what lay behind it. Hussein, while agreeing in the main with Feisal, felt that there was something to be said for Abdullah's suggestion, and accordingly instructed the latter to inform the Agency in Cairo that he was prepared to come to an understanding with Great Britain provided he could be sure of Great Britain's effective support. This reply reached Kitchener in London at the end of October 1914 almost simultaneously with a message (sent quite independently) from Sir John Maxwell G.O.C. in Egypt saying: "I think the Arabs about Mecca and Yemen ought to be approached and set against the Turks."

Kitchener responded immediately with a positive undertaking to support Hussein and the Arabs generally if they would declare for England against Turkey. In his letter Kitchener HINTED that in the event of his being proclaimed Caliph, Hussein could count on England's recognition, and went on to speak of the emancipation of "the Arabs" and of the "Arab Nation," terms which Hussein interpreted literally and unequivocally to mean THE ARABS, and not any particular Arab tribe or state.

This message from Kitchener whose prestige throughout the east transcended that of any living European, and whose word was law, definitely brought Hussein round from Feisal's view to that of Abdullah, who in his reply to Kitchener, unambiguously committed his father to a secret alliance with Great Britain, a partnership, however, in which, he made it clear. Hussein would be compelled for the time being to restrict his activities to covert preparations; and with that ended the first phase of the Anglo–Arab *pourparlers*.

* * *

This preamble was followed by an interval of eight months from December 1914 to July 1915, during which fainthearted and ambiguous incitementes to action had reached Hussein from Sir Francis Wingate, Sirdar and Governor General of the Sudan, to whom Hussein finally sent emissaries to ascertain what exactly Wingate was able and willing to do for him. Meanwhile the Shereef's son Feisal had visited Damascus where as the result of his initiation in Syrian Nationalist ideals, he abjured his pro-Turkish sympathies and was enrolled in the "Young Arab Secret Society," of which the military and civil branches had joined forces in Damascus to promote rebellion, the sole object of which was to obtain recognition of national rights and a measure of autonomy for the Sultan's Arab subjects in a "National Home" enjoying Dominion status as a federal commonwealth of Arab states within the Ottoman Empire. The revolt aimed at restricting the sovereignty of the Porte over the Arabs in exactly the same way as a similar movement in Australia had prompted those states to take advantage of England's predicament during the South African War by proclaiming their national independence and political autonomy as a Federal Commonwealth within the British Empire.

But whereas Australia's immunity from interference by the British Government during the South African War enabled her Federal States to achieve independence unhindered, most of the Arab States were directly or indirectly subject to Turkish civil and military control. Furthermore, the rebellion aimed at overthrowing the authority of the Sultan in so far as it was absolute and averse to granting the Arabs even a limited measure of national autonomy or home rule within the jurisdiction of the Porte. But the hottest heads among the "Young Arabs" had never contemplated shaking off the Turk merely to become the chattels of France and England. The Turk they knew. He had mellowed with the centuries and was tolerant towards those whose ways he understood and whose religion he too professed, if he did not always practise it. For four hundred years rulers and ruled had lived together, not always in harmony, or even in peace, but as partners whose differences time was slowly healing and between whom there was a bond akin to friendship.

At a committee meeting of the Young Arab Society held soon after the outbreak of War it was resolved "to make every effort to secure the independence of the Arab Provinces of the Ottoman Empire, BUT in the event of European designs against those Provinces APPEARING

TO MATERIALISE, the Young Arab Society pledges itself to assist Turkey in resisting foreign penetration of whatever kind."

Feisal's pro-Turkish sympathies were prompted not by any regard for Turkey but by motives identical with those which caused the ardent nationalism of the Young Arabs to hang fire, namely, fear of Europe. Both Feisal and the Young Arabs hesitated to give expression to their common desire and were restrained from coming out definitely against the Turk solely by fear of British, French, Italian and Russian designs on the Arab Provinces, fears which were very real, and in the light of subsequent events, wholly justified. The Arabs desired complete independence or autonomy within the Ottoman Empire, and failing these, to remain in status quo. Under no circumstance would they have agreed to exchange their Turkish rulers for any other, and it is certain that they would have fought strenuously in supporting the Turks to resist the domination and exploitation of their country by outsiders. Of this there never has been, the slightest doubt. The Young Arab Societies had agreed that before they would consent to lift a finger against the Porte they must be definitely assured that Turkish sovereignty would not be replaced by that of some European Power, and failing such an assurance it was resolved not to commit any hostile act against the Porte, but on the contrary, to protect their own interests by helping the Sultan to defend his Arab Provinces against foreign invasion, From Feisal who entirely concurred with this policy, the Young Arab leaders first heard of Kitchener's proposal and of the effect which that proposal had had upon the Shereef Hussein. Accordingly the Young Arabs drew up a draught agreement laying down the precise terms on which they would cooperate with Great Britain against Turkey. This protocol, or Covenant of DAMASCUS the terms of which were, its authors considered, so moderate as hardly to justify a rebellion, stipulated for:—

The recognition by Great Britain of the independence of the Arab countries lying roughly within the quadrilateral

1. formed by Syria (from the Egyptian frontier to as far north as Adana and Mersina), Irak including Mosul, and the whole of the Arabian peninsula less Aden.

2. The abolition of all privileges under the Capitulations.

3. The conclusion of a defensive alliance between Great Britain and the Sovereign Arab State.

And as her reward for the part she was to play in this one sided agreement, Britain was to be granted economic preference by her protégé!

The overwhelming extravagance of these claims furnishes the best possible evidence not only of the staggering self assurance and ingenuousness of their authors, but of the fact that the Arabs were wholly ignorant of any circumstance actual or pending which threatened to disrupt their country and parcel it out among Europeans and Jews. Least of all did they realise that by furthering the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire they would themselves be paving the way for the ultimate division of the Arab Provinces of that Empire among their "disinterested liberators." Had their object been merely to extricate themselves at all costs from Turkish domination by placing themselves voluntarily under European tutelage, they would have expressed themselves accordingly instead of in the way actually did. But the extent and uncompromising nature of their exactions clearly show their own estimate of the value to Great Britain of Arab cooperation, for which independence and nothing short of independence was the price demanded. That the Arabs had not overrated the importance to the Entente of their support is proved by the great Jemal himself who wrote: —

"If a revolt had broken out as the result of foreign intrigues there would have been no way of suppressing it, and the Government would have lost all its Arab territories." Having sworn to abide by the principles laid down in the Damascus Covenant, the Young Arab leaders appointed Hussein to speak for them and for the whole Arab nation, and promised Feisal that if the Shereef could conclude a treaty with Great Britain on the basis of their Covenant, the Arab Divisions of the Ottoman Army in Syria would rise in open rebellion against Turkey. Whereupon Feisal returned to Mecca and acquainted his father with these facts.

* * *

Meanwhile the British authorities had been unusually busy. The newly appointed High Commissioner for Egypt, Sir Henry McMahon and his Oriental Secretariat, the Directorate of Military Intelligence in Cairo and the Sirdar Sir Francis Wingate, had all been working feverishly to avert the effects of Jihad and at the same time to gain the

support and allegiance of the most influential Moslem leaders in Egypt and the Sudan whom they had spared no pains in endeavouring to persuade that their salvation lay in an alliance with Great Britain, but failure to make any headway convinced one and all of the futility of trying to inveigle the Arabs without giving them definite assurances regarding the political future of the whole of Arabia. As an indispensable condition of a summons to revolt, Moslem leaders in Egypt demanded guarantees of independence for their Arab followers in Syria and Iraq, guarantees which no British official in Egypt was able to give.

In despair Anglo–Egyptian officialdom appealed to Downing Street where as the result of Wingate's representations, assiduously supported by Kitchener, Asquith's inner-Cabinet instructed McMahon to issue a proclamation on the lines advocated by Wingate, containing definite assurances concerning the future of Arabia and of the Caliphate.

Accordingly in June 1915 the British Government's decree went forth throughout Egypt and the Sudan, Syria and the coast of Arabia. In this proclamation Great Britain promised to recognise and uphold the Arabian Peninsula as an independent Arab State exercising full sovereignty over the Holy Places of Islam! This incredibly stupid effort did nothing to satisfy Arab political aspirations and nothing to appease the misgivings of those whom it was expressly intended to hoodwink, for on the essential Arab demand that Britain's guarantee should include Syria and Iraq as well as the Peninsula, the proclamation was emphatically dumb.

With this fiasco ends the tentative or inconclusive period of Anglo–Arab negotiations. Henceforth they are characterised on the British side by evasion tempered with the unscrupulous recklessness of politicians who had persuaded themselves that necessity knows no law.

* * *

CHAPTER V

THE ANGLO–SHERIFFEAN MACHINATIONS

(Continued)

THE final and definite period of the *pourparlers*, which marks the inception of the Anglo–Arab conflict proper, begins in July 1915 with the correspondence between the Shereef of Mecca and Sir Henry McMahon. The year had been fraught with disaster and the Allies were bitterly disillusioned. On the Western Front a series of failures ended in stalemate, while in the east successive titanic hammer blows had driven Russia out of the War. After three wars and four years of incessant fighting, the Turk had himself taken the initiative and was now threatening the Suez Canal and even Egypt, where he was holding up considerable British forces. Gallipoli was failing disasterously, the Grand Senussi and his ally the Sultan of Darfur were making trouble. Ottoman troops from the Yemen had invaded the Aden Protectorate and had driven the British garrison of Lahej before them to within a few miles of Aden itself, which was only saved by the timely arrival of a brigade from Egypt. Entente forces were everywhere on the defensive, and the stagnation which was general both in Europe and in the Near East, was costing Britain five millions sterling a day, and financially the end was already in sight.

So great was her need that England was prepared to pay or rather to promise (and there's the rub) anything to anyone in return for assistance, and while in this frame of mind Mr. Asquith's Government heard of the resumption of negotiations with Cairo by Hussein, who having come to an understanding with his followers on the basis of the Damascus Covenant, had addressed a letter to Sir Henry McMahon, the first of eight diplomatic Notes, which together constitute what is now known as the McMahon Correspondence.

In his letter which was based upon the Damascus Covenant, Hussein clearly and unambiguously stated his terms for Arab intervention, the gist of which was absolute independence—guaranteed by Great Britain against all foreign influence, including even Capitulations,—and an Anglo–Arab ALLIANCE. He stressed the Arabs' determination to acquire political independence and specified the conditions on which they were prepared to form an alliance with Great Britain for the specific

purpose of attaining that independence. Moreover the clause in the Damascus Covenant clearly setting out the boundaries of the proposed sovereign Arab State had been textually embodied in the letter. In addition Hussein stipulated for the recognition by Great Britain of himself as Caliph, in the event of an Arab being proclaimed in that office, and also that the Covenant's provisions regarding mutual assistance should remain valid for fifteen years or longer. Having expressed himself thus categorically, Hussein requested that a definite acceptance or rejection of his terms be returned to him within thirty days. Here then was a plain straightforward statement of facts free from the least suspicion of ambiguity or evasiveness and to which it is impossible to attribute any hidden meaning or ulterior motive. In this letter to Sir Henry McMahon, Hussein is downright and singleminded as well as explicit and comprehensive, he leaves nothing to the imagination and nothing to chance. In substance as in spirit his letter is crystal clear; would that the same could be said of McMahon's reply.

* * *

With regard to the two principals in this exchange of Notes it is essential to remember that whereas Hussein was in fact the leader and elected representative of those in whose name he spoke and to whom he alone was directly responsible, the reverse is true of Sir Henry McMahon who as a servant executing the orders of his immediate superior in office was merely the projector, or at most the amplifier, never the originator of his Government's policy.

In spite of the complete failure of McMahon's recent proclamation, the Foreign Office clung to the belief that it could hoodwink the Arabs with non-commital evasive replies and hollow promises. Accordingly it instructed McMahon at all costs to satisfy Hussein without actually committing the British Government to uphold Arab independence. McMahon was to hint and even to promise, but on no account was he to bind, the Foreign Office well knowing how difficult it would be for them to struggle free of their pledges with impunity.

But why was this? Why was the British Government so reluctant to take the plunge, so averse to face the facts and to deal honourably. Why despite its better judgement, in spite of its desperate need, did it persist in the childish belief that it could win the Arabs with empty promises without committing itself to Hussein's terms. Why did it

imagine that the Arabs would after all be induced by deception to regard the clumsy pseudonym Arabian Peninsula as synonymous with Country of the Arabs. The fact is that it did not. The Foreign Office was well acquainted with all the circumstances of the case but it well knew, indeed none better, with whom it would have to reckon later for a false step made now. It knew, as every sane child knows, that to promise the impossible is to court disaster, but it realised that in this case to deal honourably would mean disclosing the facts, which was tantamount to the rejection *in toto* of Hussein's terms, and this was out of the question.

The Arabs were asking for that which the British Government could not give. The "Country of the Arabs," that is, the habitat in Asia of the Arab Race, would never be a political entity. The southern "Arabian Pensinsula" Arabia Deserta, consisted mostly of autonomous Arab States, the continued independence of which Britain was prepared to assure, but the whole of the northern "Arabia Felix," Syria, Iraq and even parts of Anatolia had long since been assigned to France, Italy and Great Britain. Left to themselves it is just possible that the British Government might have come to some working arrangement with the Arabs, but they were not their own masters; they were bound hand and foot not only by recent secret commitments but by precedent, and behind them, watching jealously, relentlessly, was France; and behind France, Zion.

* * *

To follow the development of events in Palestine it is essential to bear in mind what, as previously stated, was being enacted behind the scenes in the Chancelleries of Europe and the U.S.A. but it is equally important never to lose sight of the broader historical background. The ultimate acquisition of Syria by France was an accepted tenet of French foreign policy long recognised by the Foreign Office, whose concurrence rested upon historic warrant. A French army had occupied Syria from 1799 to 1801. Thirty eight years later the Powers assisted Turkey to eject the Egyptian invaders under Ibrahim Pasha, solely in order that they themselves might take his place as rulers of Syria, as was proved by the fact that France refused to ratify the subsequent Treaty. of London (July 15, 1840) as she was highly offended at not being allowed to remain in permanent military occupation!

No sooner had the Egyptians departed than serious disorders broke out in the Lebanon as the result of the activities of French and British political agitators who fomented trouble between Moslems, Christians and Druses in order to afford the Powers a pretext for interfering in the affairs of these rival factions, of whom the Papist Maronites were patronised by France and the Druses by England. This period of chaotic unrest was followed by a few years of comparative peace during which the political centre of gravity shifted to Jerusalem where quarrels among the Christian factions over privileges relating to the so-called Holy Places, spread to the European Chancelleries, and finally led to the Crimean War which originated in a dispute between the Greek and Latin ecclesiastical authorities concerning the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem.

The question was whether in order to pass through the building into their grotto of the Nativity situated in the vaults below, the Papist monks should have the key of the principle door of the Church and also one of the keys of each of the two doors of the Sacred Manger, and whether they should be at liberty to place in the Sanctuary of the Nativity a silver star adorned with the arms of France!

In pursuance of urgent instructions from the Pope's lieutenant in France, the Emperor Napoleon III, Monsieur de Lavalette pressed his case with such success at Constantinople that the Latin Patriarch, amid great ceremony, was permitted to place the glittering emblem of French dominion in the Sanctuary of Bethlehem and at the same time to receive the key of the Great Door of the Church as well as the keys of the Sacred Manger. Indignant at this "outrage" on the Orthodox Church, the Emperor Nicholas I of Russia, considered it necessary to adopt precautionary measures in order to support Russian claims and to neutralise the effect of French political intrigue. One of the "precautionary measures" was the despatch of the Fifth *Corps d'armée* to the frontiers of the Danube. The result was the Crimean War.

At the conclusion of peace the Sultan issued a decree which recognised the complete equality before the law of all creeds throughout the Ottoman Empire.

But although the attainment of religious liberty in the Holy Land had been the professed object of the Crimean War, its realisation as the result of the Sultan's hattisherif [decree] satisfied none of the Powers' ambitions, and the period of tranquility which ensued did not last long. On April 15, 1856 Great Britain, France and Austria guaranteed the

integrity of the Ottoman Empire which included of course Syria, but three years later the same Powers having first agitated in vain for financial reforms in Turkey, intervened diplomatically in Syria on the pretext of protecting Roman Catholic interests in Damascus. Actually no religious interests were at stake either in Damascus or elsewhere in Syria, but in order to attain political ascendency the Maronite clergy at the instigation of France had incited the peasants to revolt and the resulting disorders led to a general conflagration between Maronites and Druses, supported respectively by France and Great Britain. The whole country was soon involved in wholesale rioting and murder. The climax was reached in 1860 with an appalling massacre of Christians by Moslems in Damascus. Eleven thousand people lost their lives and the destruction of property was proportionately great. The worst sufferers were of course France's protegés the Papist Missions and the Jesuits who were subjected to every outrage of which murder and pillage were not the worst.

The effect of this French political *coup* had exceeded the most sanguine hopes of its authors and the result was according to plan. Under cover of the guns of a European Fleet off the Syrian ports, strong Franco–British protests were followed up at once by diplomatic intervention, and as a result of the ensuing Convention of Paris, signed in August 1860, France was authorised to occupy Syria with 12,000 men, of whom 4,000 landed at Beirut on August 22, 1860, when in order to placate the invaders, the Turkish authorities in Damascus instituted savage reprisals, including wholesale executions lasting several days, of officials "responsible" for the anti-Papist demonstrations. This was followed by the arrival in Damascus of a British political commission and the advance into the Lebanon of the French troops, who by November 1860 had effected the "pacification" of the country, and who were withdrawn again in the following June after heated, protracted but abortive discussions respecting the permanent occupation of Syria by France.

Partons pour la Syrie was the most popular *air* [patriotic song] in France under the Second Empire, as it was the most popular theme for a decade before the War. France suspected English designs on Turkey in Asia, and Russia was running her French ally very close. So jealous was France that two years before the War some British minor officials, globe-trotting in Syria, had been made the subject of an interchange of diplomatic Notes, and at the instigation of the notorious Joseph Caillaux

who had himself visited Syria on behalf of his Government, the Quai d'Orsay actually took the Foreign Office to task for permitting its servants to "trespass on French preserves in Syria," and demanded an explanation. Whereupon Sir Edward Grey found it expedient to assure Poincaré that Great Britain had no political stake in Syria and would never set up a claim to territorial rights in that country. Therewith on December 21, 1912 the French Prime Minister made Grey's *dementi* the subject of a public announcement in the Chambre, wherein Poincaré definitely asserted that France regarded Syria as a French preserve and intended it to be thus recognised and treated by all. This pronouncement was followed by further manifestations of French activity and by visits to Syria of politicians and others who spoke openly confirming Poincaré's declaration.

France's puppet-Sultan of Morocco visiting Syria under French auspices in 1913 stated publicly that the occupation of Syria by France was "necessary, inevitable and near." Italy too had designs on Arab territory, particularly in Asir and Yemen, with a view to establishing a sphere of influence and a naval base on the eastern shore of the Red Sea. Certain Roman Catholic elements in Syria especially the Maronites had been suborned by France and were agitating for French protection. The Francophile hysteria of these so-called Christians was the work of the notorious Jesuit Georges Picot, French Consul at Beirut who had persuaded a number of notable Syrian Papists to swear allegiance to France in the event of a war with Turkey. On the outbreak of hostilities however, Picot bolted in a hurry leaving behind him the incriminating evidence against his unfortunate dupes, numbers of whom were seized and imprisoned or publicly hanged by Ahmed Jemal Pasha. Not five months after the outbreak of War, France and England had agreed upon a division of the Turkish Provinces among the Entente. The secret Convention of London and the Sykes–Picot Treaty were concluded tacitly though none the less effectively, long before the official dates of their respective ratifications.

By March 1915, over a year previous to the signing of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, the French and British Governments had already consented to the annexation by Russia of territory extending from Constantinople to northern Iraq. The whole of Syria with the provinces of Mersina, Adana and Mosul were included in the already preponderating French zone; Adalia was allotted to Italy, while among England's perquisites were the "Overland Route to India" comprising

the whole of Iraq with Baghdad and a strip of Syria adjacent to the port of Haifa. Alexandretta was to be a free port, and “Palestine” was earmarked for the “special régime” which has since made it notorious. In order to form a buffer between the French and British possessions it was decided to turn whatever territory was left over or discarded by the High Contracting Parties into an autonomous Arab State or Confederation of States!

* * *

On receiving Hussein’s broadside McMahon had appealed to the Foreign Office; but even the Foreign Office was unable to find a formula which would reconcile:—

(A.) “creating an autonomous Arab buffer-state consisting of territorial scraps discarded by the Entente” with

(B.) “guaranteeing the absolute independence of all Arab territory south of Anatolia together with their complete freedom from any outside interference.”

Hopelessly handicapped by this truly gargantuan skeleton in its cupboard the Foreign Office instructed McMahon, as previously stated, “at all costs to satisfy Hussein; to be non-committal and evasive; to hint, and even to promise; but on no account to bind.” In his reply to the Shereef, McMahon carried out his instructions to the letter in all but the most important item. He failed utterly to satisfy or even to reassure Hussein, to whom the British High Commissioners transparently dishonest rigmarole came as something of a shock. McMahon’s Note is dated August 30, 1915; very near the time limit fixed by Hussein. It is a pitiful exhibition, and one of which any nation should be thoroughly ashamed. It constitutes a last desperate effort to succeed by a foul and incidentally very foolish strategem, hoping that in the end something would turn up to justify the means.

Had its purpot been less sinister the missive might have caused Hussein considerable amusement. There was no such thing at the British Agency in Cairo as an Arabic scholar, no one even conversant with classical “King’s Arabic,” with the result that the High Commissioner’s reply was couched in the Agency’s most flowery Bimbashi, decked out in that grossly obsequious and utterly ludicrous flummery beloved of the garrulous babu. Having regard to its provenance and the motive which had so palpably inspired the letter, its

frippery irritated Hussein, who moreover felt no little concern at the unmistakable evidence of treachery in an official communiqué from a Minister of the Crown representing a great nation, of whose sons Hussein had always regarded Kitchener as the personification. The theme of McMahon's message was a reiteration of the vague assurances repeatedly given in Kitchener's name both relating to "Arab Independence" and the Caliphate, but when it came to defining the exact purport of those assurances and to a geographical specification of the site and sphere of that independence, McMahon actually had the presumption to assert that in his opinion it was clearly a waste of time to discuss such matters during the stress and strain of war, and (incredible as it may seem) because Turkey still occupied the greater part of the Arab Provinces! And this if you please in answer to a proposition occasioned by those very incidents of war, and of which the whole object was to demonstrate that by adopting his plan, Britain would enable Hussein to assist her in putting an end to the occupation of Arab countries by Turkey! And then to cap all, McMahon solemnly stated that the moment for discussion had not arrived because in the areas held by the Turks certain of the Sultan's Arab subjects were still serving in the Ottoman Army! The Shereef's rejoinder to this typically Irish palaver was straight from the shoulder, single-minded and clean. Hussein could see through McMahon with ease but with true Arab philosophy he preferred to attribute his duplicity to ignorance, and merely gave McMahon to understand that his verbiage was not appreciated and that a little plain speaking and straight dealing would be welcome. He expressed surprise at the High Commissioner's vague and indefinite treatment of the frontier question and insisted that this question of the Arab frontiers must be regarded as basic and essential because it was held to be so by all his followers including those whom circumstances had forced to serve under the Sultan. He went on to make it quite clear that the result of the negotiations between himself and McMahon depended solely upon whether Great Britain would accept or reject the proposed frontiers of an independent Arab State. This time Hussein's directness went home. He had not minced his words, the force of his argument was compelling and McMahon could evade the issue no longer. Faced with a situation which demanded swift decisions and a straight answer, the Foreign Office decided to throw caution to the four winds and to make a last desperate bid for Arab support against Turkey.

It was agreed at once to promise Hussein enough to bring him openly and definitely into the fold. This could be achieved by “concluding” a secret understanding with him behind the backs of the French and temporarily at their expense. As soon as the Arabs were irrevocably committed to war, however, a secret treaty, this time with the French (unknown to and at the expense of the Arabs) would automatically render the *pro forma* arrangement with Hussein inoperable, as France and England together could easily prevent the Arabs from pressing their claim especially as there was no documentary evidence to show that there had ever been a recognised official Treaty between Great Britain and the Arabs, but only the semiofficial “McMahon correspondence” to which the Entente would refuse to grant official diplomatic status and which would therefore be inadmissable as exhibits in evidence at any legal or political *imbroglio*, moreover as these letters were to remain in the original vernacular, they were extremely unlikely ever to see the light of day.

Accordingly Great Britain’s High Commissioner in Cairo was instructed to go all out in making a dead set at the Shereef while carefully avoiding commitments out of which it would be difficult to wriggle, a task which in itself presented no insurmountable difficulties, and was not uncongenial to McMahon. Moreover he was to write with an eye on France who it was feared might one day be glad of the opportunity afforded by irrefutable evidence of perfidy, to blackmail her faithless partner. It was essential therefore to be able to show that England never really intended to double-cross her ally, but on the contrary to impress upon Hussein that while there was nothing to impede her liberty of action in dealing with the delimitation of the future Arab frontiers, Britain was nevertheless in honour bound to do nothing which might prejudice French interests. Hence the insistence on reservations in France’s favour, but hence also the broad hints to Hussein that Anglo–Franco solidarity would in practice tend to assist rather than hinder the redemption of Britain’s pledges regarding Arab independence given in Kitchener’s name and reiterated by the British Government. McMahon’s reply to Hussein’s proposal of September 9, stands out in a class by itself as the most important document in the whole of the Anglo–Arab controversy.

It clearly sets out the pledges which inveigled the Arabs into the War on the side of the Entente and remains to this day the main piece of incriminating evidence upon which the Arabs base their case against

Great Britain, who, they affirm has incontestably and repeatedly broken faith with them, an accusation which the McMahon correspondence fully justifies. In the letter under review of October 24, 1915, Hussein is asked to believe that McMahon's previous disinclination to discuss frontiers merely signified that in his opinion it was too early as yet to consider such matters conclusively, but now that the Shereef had stressed the fundamental importance and urgency of the question, the British Government had authorised McMahon to reply to his proposal by assuring him that "IN SO FAR AS GREAT BRITAIN WAS AT LIBERTY TO ACT WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO FRENCH INTERESTS" the British Government definitely pledged itself to recognise and uphold Arab independence throughout the entire territory contained within the boundaries delimitated by Hussein in his communiqué of September 9, excepting as regards the districts of Mersina and Alexandretta as well as those parts of Syria WEST OF THE DISTRICTS of Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo which "cannot claim exclusive Arab nationality and must on that account be exeluded." Furthermore, the British Government guaranteed to secure the Holy Places against foreign aggression, and concluded their address with the hope that these pledges would conduce to a lasting alliance between Great Britain and the Arabs, and that one of the first fruits of this alliance would be the expulsion of the Turks from Arab territory and the liberation of the Arab nation. Here then, adroitly and unobtrusively woven into the text is the legal quibble or saving clause which constitutes the essence of the whole fraud, and upon which the British Government relied to get themselves out and to let the Arabs in. To Hussein, as indeed to anyone unaware of Britain's previous commitments, the sentence "In so far as Great Britain is at liberty to act without prejudice to French interests" would under the circumstances mean no more than a conventional expression of courtesy and good faith from one ally to another, which is precisely what it was intended to do. But in view of the aforesaid anticipation of the London Convention and the Sykes–Picot Treaty, at least eight months before Hussein received McMahon's fateful concoction of October 24, the pledges made by Great Britain regarding the Arab territories delimitated by Hussein, were not only prejudicial but positively hostile to French interests, as the British Government was now assigning to Hussein the identical areas which it had agreed should be allotted to France. Therefore the pivotal clause "In so far as Great Britain is at liberty to act

etc." automatically rendered McMahon's acceptance of Hussein's terms null and void; for inasmuch as the sole condition upon which depended the validity of Britain's pledge, i. e. "her liberty to act without prejudice to French interests" had been cancelled by her secret understanding with France, Great Britain was not in fact at liberty to act at all. Actually therefore, the British Government were mortgaging property of which they had already secretly disposed, and were contracting a debt which they well knew could never be repaid, and which by its magnitude and very nature must inevitably lead to the ruin of the mortgagee.

Blissfully ignorant of the true state of affairs, Hussein replied at once consenting to the exclusion of Adana with the port of Mersina from the domain of Arab independence, but refusing to accede to the severance of any part of Syria including the aforesaid northern coastal regions west of the districts of Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo because, unlike Adana and Mersina, they were exclusively Arab. The Shereef also asked for an undertaking from Great Britain that she would continue to support the Arabs and champion their cause at the Peace Conference where he suspected they might be considered "informal" belligerents.

In his reply McMahon adheres to his reservations regarding the northern maritime regions, now no longer because they were not purely Arab but, significantly enough, on the plea that French interests were involved! However, he tries to offset this by assuring Hussein that Great Britain would not subscribe to any peace treaty which failed to provide for "the liberty of the Arab peoples."

The Shereef retorts by pointing out that as the spokesman of the Arab people he is not empowered to yield or even to compromise over McMahon's proposal to separate part of Syria from the domain of Arab independence, but in order not to disturb Anglo–French relations, and for this reason only, he proposed to set this question aside until after the War when he would take the first opportunity of establishing his followers' claim to the whole of Syria, and insists emphatically and unequivocally that the occupation of a single square foot of their country by France or any other foreign Power is quite inconceivable to the Arabs. Having obtained McMahon's explicit assurance on the basic question of the geographical delimitation of Arab independence and having such unbounded faith in British standards of justice and honourable dealing, Hussein was content to allow the question of

French INTERESTS (not possessions), in the northern maritime sector to stand over until after the War.

In his reply which is padded out with reiterations of previous assurances, McMahon commends the Shereef for deciding not to compromise Great Britain's relations with France but warns him against anticipating any relaxation of Anglo-French ties after the War. It is asserted now that this warning made it quite clear to Hussein that at the conclusion of hostilities, France would be certain to claim her privileges under the Anglo-French Treaty, and that under these circumstances Great Britain could not possibly support Hussein's demand that those areas which McMahon had excluded from the Arab sphere in his letter of October 24,[4] should be incorporated with the territories wherein Great Britain was pledged to recognise and maintain Arab independence. Had Hussein been aware of any circumstances by which France could have claimed privileges in Syria with or without British support, there would have been reasonable grounds for asserting that he was duly warned; but as he did not even suspect the existence of an Anglo-French plot, the gratuitous "warning" conveyed no more to Hussein than McMahon had meant it to, for it was not addressed to Hussein at all, but to France, to whom it was intended to prove the undeniable loyalty of her ally while negotiating apparently behind her back.

After this brisk rally the political game closes with the score entirely in favour of McMahon who from first to last had held all the cards, mostly up his sleeve. The ensuing desultory correspondence between Cairo and Mecca consisted chiefly of reiterations and renewed expressions of loyalty to the terms of the Anglo-Arab agreement.

* * *

To sum up. The purport of the McMahon-Hussein negotiations amounted to this:—

In return for the recognition and support by Great Britain of Arab sovereignty in the areas specified by Hussein, the latter undertook to bring the Arabs as a whole into the War on the side of the Entente, and to this McMahon agreed subject to the aforesaid territorial reservations round which, for over twenty years has raged a controversial storm, at present centred in Palestine, the effects of which may ultimately disrupt the British Empire. The Anglo-Arab tragedy embraces the whole area

covered by the *ci-devant* Provinces of the late Ottoman Empire but it is in Palestine, where matters have come to a head, that the key to the whole problem must be sought. The injustice suffered by the Arabs generally has not been greater in Palestine than elsewhere but the fact that Palestine has been selected for special treatment and the strategem by which the British Government and its apologists have sought to vindicate that treatment are causing universal exasperation. One by one the Arab States have been shaking off their European "liberators," Egypt, Iraq and now, Trans-Jordan, Syria and Lebanon are emerging from foreign tutelage. Only that part of Syria which is now the British mandatory sphere of Palestine remains in bondage and is steadily drifting towards anarchy. Until its inauguration by the Balfour Declaration, Palestine was a pedagogical designation for an undefined and integral part of Syria and as such had no geographical, political or administrative entity. It was therefore unquestionably entitled to be treated as part and parcel of an indivisible Syria, itself entitled to independence as part of the area specifically delimitated and as unequivocally guaranteed in the McMahon–Hussein agreement. And this, in a word, is the gist of the Arab claim which the British Government refute while maintaining the contrary, but their attitude is not only untenable, it is quite preposterous. Nowhere do they themselves define the area of Arab sovereignty. They accept in toto, save for the specially exempted northern coastal regions, the boundaries proposed and specifically delimitated by the Shereef.

It follows therefore that unless a particular portion of the territory so defined by Hussein and accepted *en bloc* by Great Britain, was definitely cited in McMahon's reservations, that portion must be held to have constituted an integral part of the area recognised by Great Britain as forming the domain of Arab independence. Nowhere is there any allusion to Palestine. No mention is made throughout the McMahon correspondence of that part of Syria which is now the Mandated Territory of Palestine, either under its present pseudonym or as it would have been designated in Ottoman administrative language the "Sanjaq of Jerusalem, extended to include part of the adjoining vilayet of Beirut." And for excellent reasons. Firstly because no such place existed. Moreover it was imperative to keep both Hussein and France in the dark concerning the Anglo–Jewish conspiracy with regard to Palestine, which had it been suspected would have immediately and irrevocably sent Hussein straight into the Turkish camp. Furthermore,

any indiscretion anent an integral part (even though disguised under an imaginary name) must inevitably be construed as applying to the whole, especially by France, who would have cut up very rough had she discovered the extent to which Great Britain was preparing to trespass on her special preserves.

McMahon's course was of necessity a devious one. His acceptance of Hussein's delimitations of the frontiers satisfied the Arabs, while any possibility of ultimate friction with France was forestalled by his exclusion of the north western maritime region a reservation which did not affect Palestine, for the eventual possession of which the Jews already held the most effectual guarantees. Thus did he hoodwink the Arabs and conciliate the French while inadvertently serving the Zionists.

The fraudulent policy initiated by McMahon in the letters which bear his name has been confirmed and perpetuated by the British Government in a succession of similar broken agreements and mendacious denials, the accumulated effects of which are coming home to roost with an intensity and persistence that have turned the Palestine question into a major political crisis.

CHAPTER VI

THE SYKES–PICOT TREATY

NO sooner was the McMahon–Hussein agreement concluded than negotiations were started in London at the beginning of 1916 by the Foreign Office with the French Government. The object of this manoeuvre was to confirm and ratify the less formal London Convention of 1915 by which the Allies had agreed to help themselves without stint or scruple to whatever they coveted most at the impending disruption of the Ottoman Empire. In addition the British Government was anxious to pin France down to a definition of her notoriously extravagant pretensions with regard to Syria, and if possible to render them compatible with British interests, especially with those provided for under the terms of the McMahon–Hussein agreement, the very existence of which the Foreign Office was careful not to disclose to the French Government.

The Conference was conducted on behalf of France by Monsieur Georges Picot of sinister notoriety, and representing Great Britain, by Colonel Sir Mark Sykes, Bart. M. P. who had been appointed expert adviser on the “East” to the Foreign Office. This truly remarkable person was a Yorkshire landowner of considerable means and a noted breeder of race-horses, who when a boy had travelled with his father in the Levant, and as is usual with wealthy globe-trotters, had written several books on eastern subjects. A fanatical Jesuit, he had dabbled in the classics and passed for a virtuoso, a scholar and a wit. He was a confirmed dreamer and idealist; a restless erratic pursuer of quixotic myths. He was gifted but unstable and shallow to a degree. His knowledge of Syria which was superficial and patchy, had been acquired by intuition rather than by study or experience. Both Picot, and for some unaccountable reason, Sykes, were given a free hand by their respective Governments, and as a result of their ultra-secret diplomacy, the crafty Picot who dominated his erratic co-religionist, secured for France the whole of Syria with a large slice of Anatolia and most of northern Iraq, including Mosul, as far as the Persian frontier, while Sykes was put off with an isolated ten mile “reserve” round the Bay of Acre, and southern Iraq connected with the Egyptian frontier by a corridor through the Arabian desert. The two plenipotentiaries succeeded in drawing up a scheme for the final absorption by France

and Great Britain of those Turkish Provinces which it had been tacitly agreed early in 1915 should be divided between Britain, France and Italy. They then proceeded to St. Petersburg, there to continue their deliberations with Sazonoff, against whom and Georges Picot, Sir Mark Sykes pitted his puny wits in vain. Eventually the three arrived at an understanding which was formally concluded at the end of May 1916 by Sir Edward Grey, M. Paul Cambon and Count Benckendorf.

The Sykes–Picot Treaty was a great deal more than a formal agreement between Allies over their respective spheres of influence; it was a categorical division of the spoils among conquerers whose powers within their respective areas were to be sovereign, absolute and unchallengable. Each of the French and British spheres were divided into two distinct categories:—

All the most densely populated, productive and valuable parts including the coasts, supporting the most enlightened sections of the population were to be virtually annexed and treated as colonies, while in the sparsely populated inland steppes and deserts, the Treaty magnanimously provided for autonomous Arab administrations to be recognised and upheld by the Power concerned.

Although the early informal treaties of 1915 vaguely recognised Palestine as a separate entity to be administered under some special régime, the word Palestine did not apply to a particular area within specific boundaries, but to an indefinite region or no-mans-land lying between the as yet undefined frontiers of the future Anglo–French concessions. It was not until the spring of 1916 that Palestine came into being as a geographical and administrative entity.

Palestine was born at the Sykes–Picot conclave as the result of a brawl among the conspirators over their respective shares of the loot.

For a considerable time before the War, Kitchener had been trying to impress upon the Foreign Office the strategic and economic importance of southern Syria both as regards the overland route to India, the balance of power in the eastern Mediterranean and the Suez Canal. After the outbreak of War, Kitchener who was then a Cabinet Minister became so insistant that Mr. Asquith appointed a special committee to examine the claims of Russia and especially of France to portions of the Ottoman Empire in the light of the policy advocated by Kitchener, whose views the committee endorsed, when in June 1915 i. e. at least four months before the dispatch to Hussein of McMahon’s crucial letter of October 24, it reported that France’s claim might be allowed without

prejudice to British interests only with regard to northern Syria, but that the whole of the southern portion corresponding roughly to the precincts of modern Palestine, should be excluded from the sphere of French jurisdiction and ear-marked for a "special régime." It was therefore precisely in accordance with Kitchener's policy and with the finding of Asquith's committee that McMahon was directed while negotiating with Hussein, to retain only the northern and not the southern (Palestine) part of Syria for France.

However, France persisted in pressing her claim to the whole of Syria including of course Palestine, a pretension which Britain was opposing, partly because of her own designs on the Bay of Acre which was to form the western outlet of the overland route to the Persian Gulf, and partly to keep France at a convenient distance from the Suez Canal. The official line taken by Great Britain in fighting the French claim to the whole of Syria was that the Holy Places in and around Jerusalem called for a "special régime" of their own. France retorted by suggesting that Jerusalem and Bethlehem should constitute a separate enclave under a "special régime" of international control in accordance with its sacred character, but that apart from this reserve "Palestine" should remain an integral part of Syria and as such, be included in the French zone.

No sooner had the Sykes–Picot *pourparlers* opened in Russia, however, than Sazonoff expressed his desire to establish a protectorate over the entire Holy Land where Russian interests and concessions extended far beyond the bounds of the enclave suggested by France. This was strenuously opposed both by France and Great Britain; whereupon Sazonoff declared his willingness to support France's "special régime of international control" on condition that it was made applicable to the whole of the Holy Land so as to comprise all Russian Church property and concessions. Britain seized the opportunity and immediately fell in with Sazonoff's gratuitous proposition, whereat France had to give way. Only Great Britain and Russia remained to prolong the contest, and of these the ultimate survivor was Great Britain. *When thieves fall out the Jew comes into his own*; and thus was born the Anglo–Judaic state of Palestine.

The proceedings from beginning to end had been perfidiously concealed from Italy, one of the original partners in the 1915 Convention, but especially from the Arabs, every one of whose rights under the McMahon–Hussein agreement had been abrogated thereby,

and who, had they known the truth, would have then and there repudiated their alliance with Great Britain. But Hussein was victimised by his own credulity, by his unshakable belief in British good faith, a superstition, prevalent at that time throughout the East, which had originated in Kitchener's phenomenal personality. Simultaneously with their betrayal in London by the ratification of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, and on the day of Kitchener's death, the Arabs sealed the McMahon–Hussein pact with their own blood, for in Mecca on June 5, 1916 were fired the first shots of the Arab revolt.

CHAPTER VII

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

THE year 1917 began ominously with Zionism everywhere in the ascendant. So great was the influence exerted by Jews holding high office under President Woodrow Wilson, both on the Chief Executive and on members of Congress, that the national policy of the U.S. was virtually controlled by Jewry, of which the masses and most of the leaders had been won over to Zionism as a result of intensive propaganda. Early in 1917 when the Allies were perilously near defeat and were literally facing bankruptcy, Rufus Daniel Isaacs Viscount Reading was selected out of all the King Emperor's subjects to represent the sovereign power of the world's Greatest Empire at the bar of Mammon in America where he prevailed upon Zion to bring the U.S. into the War against the German and Ottoman Empires. Jewry's oldest and bitterest enemy Russia was effectively disposed of in March when the Tzar's government succumbed to the forerunners of Bolshevism under Kerensky, and on April 6, President Woodrow Wilson declared war, thereby committing the U.S. to the dictates of Zion, the political forces of which were now concentrated in London where preparations for the inauguration of the Jewish National Home in Palestine were in full swing.

Of Zionism's many influential Gentile proselytes none was more highly esteemed in Jewry for his inestimable value to the cause than the versatile and ubiquitous Sir Mark Sykes of whom his Jesuitry no less than his innate inconsistency had made a neo-Jew and rabid Zionist. His secret Treaty with Picot concluded, Sykes came out as a fervent supporter of Zionism to which, since the accession to power in December 1916 of its champion Mr. Lloyd George, he had devoted himself with all his customary spasmodic enthusiasm. His town house at 9, Buckingham Gate which had been thoroughly equipped as an office even to telegraphic communication, became London's principal Zionist stronghold; and collaborating with Sykes, or rather shadowing him, was the inevitable Georges Picot whose apparent interest in Zionism partly concealed his real motive which was espionage on behalf of the French Government.

The first official meeting of the Zionist Political Committee took place on February 7, 1917, at the London house of Dr. Moses Gaster,

besides whom there were present Nahum Sokoloff, Chaim Weizmann, Lord Rothschild, James de Rothschild, Mr. Herbert (now Lord) Samuel, Herbert Bentwich, Harry Sacher, Joseph Cowen and Sir Mark Sykes. Georges Picot was not present.

Dr. Moses Gaster was born in Rumania where he became lecturer at the Bucharest University. In 1885 he was exiled because of his seditious political activities, and came to England. Here he was appointed Ilchester Lecturer at Oxford University and became Chief Rabbi of the Sephardic community and President of the English Zionist Federation and of the Jewish Historical Society, as well as a prominent member of the Anglo-Jewish Association and the Royal Asiatic Society.

At this inaugural meeting on February 7, 1917 was discussed in detail the full Zionist programme which was to serve as a basis for the official negotiations covering the future mandates of Palestine, Mesopotamia and an Arab Kingdom of the Hejaz. This elaborate programme relating to the disposal in advance by the Jews of the whole of that part of the Near East which was to come under British jurisdiction, had already been drafted before the end of 1916 by Dr. Moses Gaster in collaboration with Chaim Weizmann, Sokoloff, Bentwich, and Joseph Cowen, with the unofficial but none the less fervent support of the British Cabinet.

On February 8, i. e. the day after the inaugural meeting of the Zionist Political Committee at which was decided the fate of Palestine, there was held, this time at the London house of Sir Mark Sykes, another conference at which the secret Sykes-Picot Treaty was discussed in the light of the Zionist policy approved by the Political Committee in the presence of Sykes on the previous day.

After the aforesaid meetings on February 7 and 8 of the Zionist Political Committee, its Chairman Nahum Sokoloff left for Paris, and on March 22 was received at the Quai d'Orsay where HIS VERSION of the Committee's programme was approved on behalf of the French Government by the Ministry who authorised him to telegraph its decision to the Zionist Organisation of Russia, and most important of all, to that of the U.S.A. for it was not on the battlefields of the Old World or in the European Chaneelleries that was decided the outcome of the Great War and the ultimate fate of all the belligerent nations, but in New York where the titanic struggle had raged insidiously but relentlessly between the combined resources of a dying experiment in civilisation,

and the full force of Jewish money-power embodied in the Executive Council of the U.S. Federal Banks and the U.S. Federal Reserve Board, the ruthless instruments of Zionism which by the beginning of 1917 had become the arbiter of human destiny.

However, despite Anglo–Judaic machinations, Government circles in Paris were alarmed lest Great Britain's growing influence and prestige in the Levant would lead to the establishment there of a British hegemony, and it was to the frustration of this that the Quai d'Orsay were now devoting themselves with an ardour and single-mindedness worthy of a better cause.

Accordingly a French mission under Georges Picot had been sent to Cairo in order to undermine British influence while furthering the cause of French interests in Syria by means of subversive political propaganda among the Arab notables in Egypt. Reports and sinister rumours concerning Picot's activities had aroused Hussein's suspicions, and he requested Sir Reginald Wingate, who had succeeded McMahon as High Commissioner, to explain the object of Picot's mission. At Wingate's suggestion the Foreign Office whose turn it was to be alarmed, sent Sir Mark Sykes off to Jeddah post haste with the double task of setting Hussein's mind at rest, while preparing, and if possible predisposing him to the visit which the Quai d'Orsay were determined Picot should pay him and which the Foreign Office were powerless to prevent.

Sykes left at once for Rome there to find inspiration for the task in hand, and thence went on to Cairo where he consulted with the Moslem leaders and received final instructions from Wingate before proceeding to Jeddah.

If only in view of the loyalty with which he was fulfilling his part of the Anglo–Arab bargain, Hussein had every right to expect fair and honourable treatment at the hands of his partner, but if he did, it was because he knew nothing as yet of that moral code upon which depends the sanctity of treaties. Sykes had his first interview with the Shereef at the beginning of May and returned a fortnight later, this time with Georges Picot.

On May 19 and 20 Hussein received the two delegates with whom he discussed their respective interests at great length, but beyond the usual conventional references to Anglo–French solidarity, assurances of which their presence there together was itself a refutation, neither Sykes nor Picot let fall a single word, then or at any other time, which

might have led Hussein to suspect the existence of anything resembling the Sykes–Picot Treaty. When he was asked whether his followers would agree to the creation of a French sphere of influence in the Lebanon, the Shereef replied that as spokesman of the National Movement he was debarred from countenancing the slightest infringement of Arab sovereign independence. With that the visit ended and the delegates left, Picot to continue his anti-British machinations in Cairo, while Sykes returned to London where he arrived on June 14, from which date he was occupied continuously until November in collaboration with the Zionist Political Committee with the preparation of the notorious Balfour Declaration, a laborious process, as every point settled in London was submitted to the United States for scrutiny by the executives of the American Zionist Congress consisting of Dr. Schmaryar Levin's International Inner Actions Committee and the Greater Actions Committee, whose criticisms received the most respectful and minute attention in London, where the text of the Declaration was carefully drafted under Ginzberg's directions by the Zionist Political Committee consisting of Nahum Sokoloff (Chairman), Simon Marks (secretary), Chaim Weizmann, Leopold Kessler, Joseph Cowen, Herbert Bentwich, Albert M. Hyamson, Harry Sacher, Israel Sieff, Leon Simon, Ettinger and Volkovski.

Though the obstacles confronting them were formidable, both Jewish and British Zionists were learning to profit by past experience which clearly revealed the futility of frontal attacks and stressed the importance of turning the enemy's flank. During the reign of Abdul Hamid the Zionists made several attempts to induce the Porte to sanction a higher rate of Jewish immigration into Palestine, but without success. After the revolution powerful Jewish elements in the Committee of Union and Progress C.U.P. at first swayed the Young Turk régime in favour of Zionism but their influence was short lived and ended in 1912 when Arab members protested angrily in the Turkish Parliament against the acquisition by Jews of agricultural land in Palestine as the result of dispossessing and evicting its Arab peasant owners. It was clear that the Arabs were irreconcilable to Jewish territorial claims, and for this as for reasons previously stated, the Zionists decided to avail themselves of the accommodating and capacious "Trojan Horse" provided by Great Britain, to whom the War had revealed the vulnerability of Egypt's eastern frontier and the consequent necessity of establishing a buffer between herself and the

new French possessions threatening the Suez Canal; and Palestine even in Turkish hands would constitute a potential danger rather than a safeguard against such a threat. But now that France had announced her intention of claiming Palestine as an integral part of her rightful preserves in Syria, she would automatically extend her frontiers right down to the Egyptian border. It became all the more essential therefore for Britain to keep France at a safe distance and to establish an effective buffer between herself and her ally, a buffer moreover consisting of something a good deal more substantial than the ephemeral "special international régime" area of the Sykes–Picot agreement; a British buffer in fact. But a British buffer was synonymous with a British protectorate or possession, which would not be tolerated either in the U.S. or in France who was already profoundly suspicious and jealous of her ally. Accordingly, to circumvent American and French hostility, Great Britain had recourse to the Zionist Trojan horse. Hence the Balfour Declaration which completely stifled both American and French objections and did not affect Britain's relations with the Arabs as these latter had never heard of it. It also enabled Great Britain to claim with a show of reason and justice that as she had solemnly undertaken to make a National Home for the Jews in Palestine, it was only logical and right that she should shoulder the responsibility of governing Palestine in the performance of that undertaking. The Balfour Declaration sealed the Anglo–Judaic partnership and definitely settled the trend of British policy in the Near East. Hitherto Jew and Briton had angled for reciprocal advantages while each side jockeyed for position, a game at which the Jew excelled by manoeuvering his opponent into disadvantageous financial, political or strategical situations to escape from which the victim had to accept the good offices,—at a price, of the author of his misfortunes. The first care of the British Government had been to satisfy themselves that in the event of their declaring openly for Zionism, the Jews would support the establishment of British sovereignty in Palestine. When at the decree of Lord Northcliffe, Lloyd George took the helm in December 1916, the Zionists submitted a plan for the administration of Palestine by Great Britain or France, or by both together in partnership. This Anglo–French cooperation was the last thing which the Zionists wished to bring about, but by holding up the French bogey the Jews hoped to frighten the British Government into complying with Zionist policy. At that time neither the British nor the French Governments suspected that the Zionists had been familiar with

every word of the Sykes–Picot Treaty from its very inception, an inealeulable advantage of which Zionist diplomacy was not slow to make the most, and as the Jews rightly surmised, the idea of an Anglo–French condominium proved to be utterly repugnant to Mr. Lloyd George, whose religious scruples cried out against the desecration of the Holy Places by atheist agnostic France!!

At the first preliminary conversations the British “statesmen” reacted to the French bogey so satisfactorily and so promptly that the Zionists, whose objective was thus secured from the outset, were able then and there to discard France altogether and to give their unqualified support to an exclusively British régime in Palestine. Upon this basic understanding between Mr. Lloyd George, with Balfour as his Foreign Secretary and the Zionists, official negotiations were opened between the accredited representative of the British Government in the person of Sir Mark Sykes, and the Zionist Political Committee which included Dr. Weizmann, who at their first conference held at the house of Dr. Moses Gaster on February 7 gave Sykes clearly to understand that they were dead against an Anglo–French or any other form of international condominium for the Holy Land, and that provided Great Britain would champion Zionist aspirations they for their part would exert themselves to bring about the establishment of an exclusively British Protectorate in Palestine.

Upon these basic principles was inaugurated the conspiracy which culminated nine months later with the Balfour Declaration when it was noised abroad that by thus courageously taking up the cudgels on behalf of persecuted Jewry, Lloyd George and his Cabinet had given further proof of that high-principled humanitarianism which had always inspired and characterised their policy. During the ensuing negotiations in which the skill and endurance of the political contortionists were taxed to the utmost, the art of double crossing was exploited to a degree hitherto unknown in international politics. In order to prevent their rapid progress from assuming the appearance of a walk-over, the negotiations were “held up” now and again by such devices as “a sharp division of opinion in British Government circles” or the “vigorous opposition” of the Jew Edwin Montagu in the Cabinet; actually, however, Anglo–Judaic solidarity was firmly established, and both British and Jewish delegates were cooperating in perfect harmony.

Great Britain deemed it expedient to comply with the Zionist demands for the following considerations:—

To ensure the financial support of the Rothschilds and their allies, indispensable at any time but especially at the height of a financial crisis.

To ensure Jewish good will throughout the world both during and after the War.

A Mandate or Protectorate over Palestine and Mesopotamia gave the Mandatory Power custody of the gateway to India and to the Suez Canal, and by calling Palestine a "Jewish National Home" American, French and Italian opposition would be effectively silenced. To offset the objection that the Mandate constituted a breach of England's promise to the Arabs, the Zionists proposed to bestow upon the Arabs the territory which had been their home for 1,200 years, but with the new appelation of "Kingdom of the Hejaz." In order to anticipate possible opposition from the British taxpayer, the commercial advantages of Palestine such as the mineral wealth of the Jordan valley, the monopoly for which was granted first to Jabotinsky and later to Sir Alfred Mond (Lord Melchett) were shamelessly magnified and extolled to the skies. It was announced that the two great commercial races, English and Jew were uniting to take control of the trade routes between Europe and Asia, because as Bernard Rosenblatt's "Social Zionism" frankly tells us, "The geographical position of Palestine, as the connecting link between three continents, if held by the English and the Jews, both shop-keepers, offers the opportunity of making the land of Israel the great emporium of East and West."

One of the main difficulties lay in the obduracy of France in renouncing the least of her pretensions to a dominant position in the Holy Land. Powerful ecclesiastical groups comprising political, business and banking interests were determined to oppose the exclusion of Palestine from the sphere of French influence, and their vehement opposition made it impossible for Ribot's Government to consider any such proposal. Accordingly the Zionists, British and Jewish, were constrained to act with the greatest circumspection, and endeavoured at first to induce the French Government to recognise the principle of the Zionist claim to inhabit Palestine as distinct from ruling it, but finding these ingenuous tactics unavailing they had recourse to other and more efficacious methods. France was on her guard, but once again experience was to stand Great Britain in good stead. The publication in 1878 of the secret Anglo–Turkish Convention by which THE ADMINISTRATION of Cyprus was ceded to Great Britain by the

Porte, produced a dangerous tension in Anglo–French relations. Fearing that by occupying Cyprus, Britain was planning by devious ways, to deprive her of her hereditary rights as Principal Guardian Power of Christianity in the Holy Land, France threatened to reverse her policy of the Crimean War by making common cause with Russia against Great Britain and Turkey. However, strained as they were, Anglo–French relations did not break and on July 12, less than six weeks after the promulgation of the Anglo–Turkish Convention, the "administration" of Cyprus began simultaneously with its occupation by Admiral Lord John Hay, and he was followed a week later by Sir Garnet Wolseley as High Commissioner whose successors have governed uninterruptedly ever since.

As in 1878 so in 1917, Juda was at the helm and "the French were out-generaled." The Anglo–French *pourparlers* over Palestine had reached a complete deadlock and feeling was running high when suddenly, like a bolt from the blue came the news that through some accidental leakage the Zionists had discovered the existence of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, the provisions of which relating to the dissection and internationalisation of Palestine were causing them grave anxiety, and that Zionist resentment at the betrayal of their hopes by the signatories of the Sykes–Picot Treaty was already taking the form of angry protests and threats of reprisals. Thus assailed by the accomplice whom they had double crossed, Great Britain and France sank their own differences to unite in appeasing outraged and persecuted Jewry.

The ruse worked to perfection and after prolonged negotiations the French Government reluctantly agreed to sponsor a declaration in favour of the principle of Zionism, while from the U.S. where Mr. Justice Louis Brandeis was *de facto* in charge at the White House, came President Wilson's approbation of the terms of the proposed Declaration.

Meanwhile to complete the circle the Foreign Office had instructed Sir George Buchanan, British Ambassador in Petrograd to inform the Russian Government that Great Britain had decided to establish a national home for the Jews in Palestine. Although there had never existed a genuine divergence regarding the fundamental nature of the Jewish settlement in Palestine, there was a superficial difference of opinion respecting the terminology in which the British Government's statement of policy should be couched. The wholehoggers were

pressing for the acceptance of Ascher Ginzberg's original text prepared by Sokoloff's Political Committee, which authorised "THE RECONSTITUTION OF PALESTINE AS THE NATIONAL HOME OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE," but in this phraseology Palestine was declared a Jewish sovereign state which for reasons already explained is precisely what the more astute Zionists were particularly anxious to avoid. As members of an independent state the Jews would forfeit their international status, whereas under British protection they would forego none of the privileges peculiar to their international citizenship while enjoying all the advantages of independent sovereignty within their national home.

To get over this difficulty the moderates persuaded their left wing colleagues that while the British Government were firmly resolved to legislate according to the precepts of the original text, they would be better able to succeed if they could appear to be intending to comply with the policy expressed in the more moderate terms of the amended version. Accordingly the formula prepared by the Zionist Political Committee was altered. Instead of "recognising the reconstitution of Palestine as the national home of the Jewish people," the British Goverment announced that it would "view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people," a simple alteration by which Zion was changed from a sovereign state into a protectorate. But vital considerations other than those engendered by American and French susceptibilities and Jewish fears for their international status were behind the British Government's desire to camouflage the purely nationalist nature of the Zionist policy which it had sponsored.

The War had entered its fourth year and there was as yet no indication of a settlement. As they could not inflict a crushing defeat on the enemy, Entente politicians had been searching for a formula on which to base proposals for a peace which would result in the disintegration and permanent crippling of the Central Empires. The principle of self determination, i. e. the right of small nations to choose their own governments or govern themselves, had been put forward and generally accepted. Thus we were told that the sole object of the Allied nations in prosecuting the War was to deliver the peoples of the world from political bondage and foreign dictatorship, and to make the world safe for Democracy. But admissible as the principle undoubtedly was when directed against the enemy, the contingency of its

application to the Allied countries was now causing considerable uneasiness. That the German and Ottoman Empires should be broken up into secession states and protectorates was one thing, but the possibility of the axiom being applied to Great Britain through Ireland, and to the other Allies caused many to fear the complete dismemberment of Europe. By granting too great a measure of autonomy to the Zionists Great Britain would not only lose her own grip on Palestine but might easily be establishing a precedent the consequences of which it was impossible to foresee.

However, the die-hard elements led by Ascher Ginzberg were irreconcilable and maintained that their more conciliatory associates had betrayed the cause. “It can scarcely be necessary to explain” wrote Ginzberg, “the difference between the two versions. Had the British Government accepted version originally suggested to it, its promise might have been interpreted as meaning that Palestine was restored to the Jewish people on the ground of its historic right; and that the Jewish people were destined to rule over it and manage all its affairs in their own way without regard to the consent or non-consent of its present inhabitants. For this reconstitution is only a renewal of the ancient right of the Jews which overrides the right of the present inhabitants who have wrongfully established themselves on a land not their own.” However, as things have turned out Ginzberg’s fears were unfounded.

The Balfour Declaration which was issued in the form of a letter addressed to Lord Rothschild by the Foreign Secretary Sir Arthur Balfour, was as follows:—

Foreign Office. Nov. 2, 1917.

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty’s Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet: His Majesty’s Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by

Jews in any other country. I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours Sincerely,
Arthur James Balfour.

The Balfour Declaration was promulgated from the Foreign Office more than two years after the dispatch of McMahon's decisive letter of October 24, 1915 and eighteen months after the Shereef Hussein had committed the destiny of his country to the Entente by rising in open rebellion against Turkey. Its ratification by the other Allies was merely a matter of form between Nahum Sokoloff and the two delegates, Pichon for France, Imperiali for Italy. From subsequent debates in the French Senate on April 5 and 6, 1921, it transpired that neither the Chamber of Deputies nor the Senate had ever had the measure submitted to them for endorsement.

The Declaration occasioned great rejoicing in the Jewish and Jew-controlled gentile press and mass meetings held in London were harangued by among others Sir Mark Sykes and Sir Herbert Samuel, who when addressing the great demonstration at the London Opera house on December 2, 1917, said that he "had stood for Zionism not only in the Cabinet but outside it!"

It is clear from the above that Dr. Chaim Weizmann was right when he said "Negotiating with a Government is easy: a Government does not do things by itself, one must demand things from it, but you must know what to demand, how to demand and when to demand. If you know that, you know the whole secret: it is essential for Zionists to understand this."

CHAPTER VIII

THE ENTENTE REFUTES ITS OWN DUPLICITY

THE scene now shifts to the eastern marches of the Red Sea where for eighteen months the Shereef Hussein had striven honourably, loyally and successfully to fulfill his share of the bargain with McMahon. The first phase of the Arab revolt had ended on January 25, 1917 with the occupation of Wejh whence the insurgents gradually fought their way northwards in a series of operations culminating six months later in the capture of Aqaba, an important event which coincided with the arrival in Cairo of General Allenby who had succeeded Sir Archibald Murray as Commander in Chief of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force.

Aqaba at once became to the Arabs what Cairo was to their British Allies, i. e. a base for the political subversion no less than the military destruction of the Ottoman power in Syria. The political campaign weakened the Turks by causing the disaffection of the Syrian Arabs through intensive propaganda, which was to the effect that owing to the McMahon–Hussein pact, the aims and objects of the Allies in waging War had become identical with those of the Arabs, and that an Entente victory would bring liberty and independence to the Arab peoples. This propaganda proved highly successful politically and strategically. Owing to Arab defection the Turks were compelled to evacuate southern Palestine, and Allenby's advance on Jerusalem was greatly facilitated not only by Arab irregulars supporting his right flank but by the thinning of the Turkish ranks owing to the large number of Arabs who deserted throughout the autumn of 1917, and in spite of the determined efforts of the German Command to counter the effects of Anglo–Arab propaganda disaffection was intensified and desertions continued until, to quote Liman von Sanders "The British forces advancing on Jerusalem found themselves fighting in friendly surroundings whereas the Turks who were defending their own soil, found themselves fighting in the midst of a distinctly hostile population."

In this connection it is important to observe that throughout the political campaign launched by the British authorities, the assurances which brought about the disaffection of Arabs in the Ottoman Army and won the allegiance of the population were all made in the name of the Shereef Hussein as well as in that of Arab independence throughout

the whole of Syria (including Palestine) but excepting the Lebanon, where instead of using Hussein's name the Allies stressed the supposed solicitude of France for the future welfare of its inhabitants.

This marked differentiation between Syria and the Lebanon was entirely consistent with the reservations made in the name of France by McMahon in his correspondence with Hussein and shows conclusively that at the time of Allenby's drive towards Jerusalem, Palestine was not excluded from the area throughout which Great Britain was pledged to recognise and support an independent sovereign Arab state. The cities of Gaza, Hebron, Jaffa and Bethlehem had already fallen when Jerusalem surrendered on December 9, and by the end of the year nearly the whole of that part of south western Syria now known as Palestine, was in the occupation of Allenby's forces, whose advance had been greatly assisted by the good-will of the Arab civil population who welcomed their "liberators and Allies" with marked friendliness and spontaneous offers of assistance. Arab deserters, officers and men, streamed across to the British lines and in Jerusalem where the military had opened a recruiting station for volunteers to serve under Hussein's banner, patriotic zeal exceeded the supply of able bodied men.

* * *

The distribution and rifle strength of the Ottoman troops facing the British and Arab armies respectively, give some idea of the military value of Hussein's cooperation. West of Jordan, engaging Allenby's Expeditionary Force were the Turkish Seventh and Eighth Armies, comprising most of the best Osmanli elements with a stiffening of German technical specialists, and commanded respectively by Mustapha Kemal Pasha and Jevad Pasha; but despite their high quality they only mustered some 17,000 rifles, whereas fighting the Arabs east of Jordan were the Turkish Fourth Army and the composite Second Corps with a combined rifle strength of 14,000, in addition to the 12,000 men held in and around Medina. Thus the Turkish effectives engaged against the Arabs east of Jordan and in the Hejaz were numerically superior to those holding up Allenby's advance in Palestine.

Apart from the ever increasing number of Arab deserters, and in addition to the garrisons immobilised by Feisal and his brothers round Medina and Maan amounting in all to some 20,000, the Turks had by this time lost over 14,000 men in combat with the Arab forces, regular

and tribal. This increasingly effective cooperation in the field between Allenby and Feisal goaded the Turks into making a supreme effort to break the Anglo–Arab alliance. The German Arab-Bureau was unsparing in its efforts to spread disaffection among Hussein's followers and to ply them with tempting peace proposals. However, the political propaganda came to nothing, and the military operations served only to stimulate the Arabs and to swell the Ottoman casualty lists.

The Anglo–Arab Convention was no longer a formal political and military treaty; its outcome was no longer problematical; it was an unqualified success, and in Arab eyes it had become an indestructible Alliance in which the two partners, working together in a spirit of loyal cooperation, were resolved to see the thing through. Hussein had done a great deal more than honour his signature to the McMahon pact; he had been as good as even better than his word, and if bare justice was to have been his reward, he was already within measureable distance of attaining the height of his ambition. But the new era had hardly dawned, when suddenly without any warning, two successive blows, appalling and devastating, struck consternation and dismay into the very heart of the Arab Revolt.

From Petrograd to Mecca is a far cry, but it was from the Russian Capital that Hussein learned of his betrayal by the Entente. The first of the three accomplices in the Sykes–Picot swindle to be overtaken by Nemesis was Russia, now in the hands of the Bolsheviks, whose first act on seizing power had been to publish the secret documents from the ransacked archives of the late Imperial Ministry of Foreign Affairs, including of course the text of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, the contents and purpot of which the Porte immediately apprised the Turkish Commander in Chief in Syria Ahmed Jemal Pasha, who at once made a final determined effort to smash the Arab rebellion by revealing to Hussein the perfidy of his British and French "Allies" as proved by the Sykes–Picot Treaty.

On November 26, 1917, twelve days before the fall of Jerusalem, Jemal Pasha sent a special messenger to the Arab Headquarters at Aqaba with a letter for the Emir Feisal. In this letter the Commander in Chief appealed to the Arab leader's sense of honour and duty as a Moslem, and gave him irrefutable evidence to prove that both he and his father had been tricked into taking up arms against the Padishah, and that the text of the Sykes–Picot Treaty was itself sufficient proof that the British promise which had brought the Arabs into the war and

on which they were relying for their independence, were utterly false, inasmuch as the Entente had already decided to dismember the Ottoman Empire and divide its Arab Provinces among themselves. The Turkish Commander in Chief pointed out that as an honourable man and a devout Moslem there was only one course open to Feisal, and that was to renounce his perfidious allies and the suicidal adventure into which they had inveigled him and to return at once to his own co-religionists, the Turks, who were prepared to come to an amicable understanding with the Arabs over their legitimate national aspirations to the extent of granting full autonomy to all the Arab Provinces of the Empire. Jemal invited Feisal to come himself to Damascus, and promised that the terms of any resulting Turco–Arab agreement would be ratified by Imperial Hattisherif [decree] and fully guaranteed by the German Government. In their anxiety to ensure the success of their *démarche*, the Ottoman Government instructed Jemal Pasha to make a public statement regarding the Turkish overtures to Feisal.

On December 4, four days before the fall of Jerusalem, at a banquet given in his honour in Beirut, the Commander in Chief, in a momentous speech, announced that he had approached the Shereef Hussein with a view to a reconciliation with the Arabs. The full text of the speech, translated into Arabic, was published in all the Syrian newspapers, and copies were sent to Medina and Mecca. After reviewing the political and military situations, the Commander in Chief said:—

"... The terms of the Secret Treaty just published in Petrograd have thrown light on the process by which the British have won over the Shereef Hussein. In the early part of 1916 Great Britain, France and Russia entered into a secret agreement which was a device for bringing about an Arab revolt to suit the designs of the British who, needing tools and catspaws to serve their own ends, encouraged certain Arabs to rebel by giving them mendacious promises and hoodwinking them with false hopes. Eventually the unfortunate Shereef Hussein fell into the trap laid for him by the British, who having received an assurance from him that he would revolt, decided to secure the defence of the Suez Canal by advancing into the Sinai Peninsula. In fact it was only after they had made certain of the Shereef's defection that they crossed the Canal. That they are outside the gates of Jerusalem today, is the direct outcome of the Shereef's revolt in Mecca.

Were not the liberation promised to the Shereef Hussein by the British a mirage and a delusion, had there been some prospect,

however remote, of his dreams of independence being realised, I might have conceded some speck of reason to the revolt in the Hejaz. But the real intentions of the British are now known, and thus will the Shereef Hussein, who is responsible for the enemy's arrival at the ramparts of Jerusalem, be made to suffer the humiliation which he has brought upon himself, of having bartered the dignity conferred upon him by the Caliph of Islam for a state of enslavement to the British. I have recently addressed a letter to the Shereef in which I depicted the facts in their true light, and represented to him the gravity and the dangers of the present situation. If he is a true Moslem and has the qualities and sentiments of a real Arab, he will turn against the British and return to the fold of the Caliph and of Islam. In thus writing to him I have performed what I regard as a duty to our Faith, and I pray God that He may inspire the Shereef to follow the way of wisdom, truth and divine guidance... etc. etc."

The agony of mind into which these disclosures had thrown the Shereef and his sons was considerably aggravated by Jemal's speech, and still more by the publicity given to his statements in the Press. The Turks had made the most of their opportunity and had followed up the crushing blow inflicted upon Hussein by the disclosures from Petrograd, with a publicity campaign specially designed to expose the Shereef and his sons to the fury and resentment of their followers, and thus to force Hussein's hand before he could recover sufficiently to grapple with the new and unexpected turn of affairs. From beginning to end of their appalling ordeal both Hussein and Feisal were left without a solitary word or sign from their British ally, a fact which added to the confusion and to the nerve-wracking suspense and of course stimulated their worst fears and suspicions.

This crisis in the history of the Arab Revolt reveals the Shereef Hussein and his son Feisal in their true colours. If Feisal's faith in British standards of fair dealing was not unshaken, his innate sense of devotion to filial duty effectively stifled what misgivings assailed him. Instead of answering Jemal's letter he forwarded it at once to his father who reacted instantly and characteristically. It is not given to many men, even great men, to come through an ordeal such as this unscathed, but Hussein took it in his stride. Never for an instant did he lose his head; not once did he waver or look round. His confidence in his "friends" remained unshaken. He was magnificent.

A martinet and stubborn to a fault, overbearing in many ways, and even truculent, Hussein was a statesman; his actions prove it. Moreover he was completely guileless: and the less is a man himself dishonest, the less is he capable of seeing or suspecting dishonesty in others. Despite an extremely suspicious and cautious nature, he turned a deaf ear, not only to what appeared to be irrefutable evidence of British treachery, but to his own forebodings and his own better judgement. He would not allow himself even to doubt the loyalty of his allies until he had heard their version of the story. It was impossible for a man of his integrity to believe that responsible Ministers could be so morally gangrenous as were the political imposters in Downing Street, especially as they were the chosen leaders of a nation whose proud boast is that an Englishman's word is his bond.

Throughout his intercourse with the British Government, Hussein never deviated from the straight and narrow way of fair and honourable dealing, and he had a right to expect similar treatment from his partner, but his unswerving loyalty and above all, his blind faith in British standards of honesty, in British justice and integrity, were his undoing.

Though shocked and intensely apprehensive, Hussein refused point blank to parley with the enemy. He instructed his son to reject Jemal's proposals, and that done, he forwarded the complete dossier to the British High Commissioner in Egypt with a request for an explanation concerning the secret (Sykes–Picot) treaty which was the subject of Jemal's letter. Greatly perturbed, and feeling extremely foolish, the High Commissioner Sir Reginal Wingate referred Hussein's awkward question to the Foreign Office and waited for instructions.

* * *

The British Government's reply, which constituted the first part of their message, was telegraphed to Cairo by the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Arthur Balfour. It was translated into Arabic at the British Residency and transmitted to King Hussein by Sir Reginald Wingate. The following rendering of the telegram is not copied from the original English draft text now in the archives of the Foreign Office, but is translated from the original of Wingate's Arabic version by Mr. George Antonius, Secretary General to the Arab Delegations and Palestine Delegate to the London Anglo–Arab Conference on Palestine in February 1939.

"Documents found by Bolsheviki in Petrograd Foreign Ministry do not constitute an actually concluded agreement but consist of records of provisional exchanges and conversations between Great Britain, France and Russia, which were held in the early days of the War and before the Arab Revolt, with a view to avoiding difficulties between the Powers in the prosecution of the War with Turkey. Whether from ignorance or from malice, Jemal Pasha has distorted the original purpose of the understanding between the Powers, and overlooked its stipulations regarding the consent of the populations concerned, and the safeguarding of their interests.

He has also ignored the fact that the subsequent outbreak and striking success of the Arab Revolt, as well as the withdrawal of Russia, had long ago created an altogether different situation."

This preliminary telegraphic reply was afterwards reinforced by an official communication from the British Government to Sir Reginald Wingate, by whose orders it was translated and forwarded to Hussein through Colonel J.R. Basset, British Agent at Jedda. The following is the English translation by Mr. George Antonius of the Arabic text received by King Hussein:—

Jedda, February 8, 1918.

"I am directed by His Britannic Majesty's High Commissioner for Egypt (Sir Reginald Wingate) to forward to Your Majesty the text of a telegraphic message which His Excellency has received from the Foreign Office in London for transmission as a communication from His Britannic Majesty's Government to Your Majesty. The text is verbatim as follows:—

The loyal motives which have prompted Your Majesty to forward to the High Commissioner the letters addressed by the Turkish Commander-in-Chief in Syria to His Highness the Emir Feisal have caused His Majesty's Government the liveliest satisfaction. The steps taken by Your Majesty in this connection are only a token of the friendship and mutual sincerity which have always inspired the relations between the Government of the Hejaz and His Majesty's Government. It would be superfluous to point out that the object aimed at by Turkey is to sow doubt and suspicion between the Allied Powers and those Arabs who, under Your Majesty's leadership and guidance are striving nobly to recover their ancient freedom. The Turkish policy is to create dissension by luring the Arabs into believing that the Allied Powers

have designs on the Arab countries, and by representing to the Allies that the Arabs might be made to renounce their aspirations. But such intrigues cannot succeed in sowing dissension among those whose minds are directed by a common purpose to a common end.

His Majesty's Government and their Allies stand steadfastly by every cause aiming at the liberation of oppressed nations, and they are determined to stand by the Arab peoples in their struggle for the establishment of an Arab world in which law shall replace Ottoman injustice, and in which unity shall prevail over the rivalries artificially provoked by the policy of Turkish officials. His Majesty's Government reaffirm their former pledge in regard to the liberation of the Arab peoples. His Majesty's Government have hitherto made it their policy to ensure that liberation, and it remains the policy they are determined unflinchingly to pursue by protecting such Arabs as are already liberated from all dangers and perils, and by assisting those who are still under the yoke of the tyrants to obtain their freedom."

Both the foregoing official communications constitute a tissue of deliberate falsehoods. They evade the question at issue, prevaricate and make totally mendacious allegations. The Sykes–Picot agreement of 1916 was a properly ratified political treaty between the three signatory Powers on whom it was binding, and it was the discovery of that authentic agreement by the Bolsheviks which enabled the Turks to reveal its contents to King Hussein with the object of opening his eyes to the truth, and to induce him to repudiate an alliance into which he had been tricked. The Turkish peace proposals made entirely on the strength of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, had caused Hussein the gravest apprehension, to confirm or allay which, he had taken the conceivable to a man of honour, and had submitted them together with the disclosures which had prompted them, to his allies with a request for a straightforward answer to a straightforward question, of which the gist was simply this:—

"Is or is it not true that the Allied Powers, Britain, France and Russia have concluded a secret treaty, agreement or pact affecting the future states of the Arab Provinces of the Turkish Empire? And if so, to what extent?"

The answer vouchsafed by Mr. Lloyd George's Government was as we have seen, anything but straightforward; it was in fact no answer at all, but a despicable subterfuge designed to deceive a loyal ally. The

first paragraph of the telegram deliberately denies the very existence of "an actually concluded agreement" and pretends that what was in fact the tri-partite Sykes–Picot Treaty was merely "documents consisting of records of provisional exchanges and conversations," which it avers, "were held in the early days of the War and before the Arab Revolt."

Actually the *pourparlers* which culminated in the Sykes–Picot Treaty, were held during 1915 and 1916, but were not finally and officially ratified by the Entente Powers until the end of May 1916. In the second paragraph the British Government again evades the issue by omitting to mention the Treaty, thereby stressing their previous denial of its existence, and refers vaguely to "the understanding between the Powers" of which Downing Street accuses Jemal Pasha of maliciously distorting the original purpose!

We are not told what was its "original" as distinct (presumably) from its subsequent purpose. And we are left wondering how mere "documents consisting of records of provisional exchanges and conversations" could possibly contain "stipulations regarding the consent of the populations concerned, and the safeguarding of their interests," stipulations which, according to the British Government, Jemal Pasha had "OVERLOOKED!" The final paragraph is the clumsiest, and for that reason the most insolent of all. In this the authors of the telegram make no attempt to disguise their contempt for their ingenuous dupe. The statement, *per se*, is a truism needing no comment, but with its context and by inference, it is both mendacious and contradictory. When it says that "the striking success of the Arab Revolt and the withdrawal of Russia had created an altogether different situation," it means "now that the Arabs have given such striking proof of their military prowess, the Powers have renounced their intention of carving up the Sick Man's[5] dominions at the expense of the Arabs, who henceforth will be treated as Allies and equals, especially when it comes to dividing the spoils of war!

The collapse,—euphemistically called "withdrawal" of Russia, had of course automatically absolved her partners Great Britain and France, from their obligations to her regarding a division of Ottoman and Arab Provinces, so the Arabs had nothing to fear on that score. If there had never been a concluded agreement between Great Britain, France, and Russia regarding the future status of the Sultan's Arab Provinces but merely "provisional exchanges and conversations held with a view to avoiding difficulties between the Powers in the prosecution of the War

with Turkey," how could Jemal Pasha have "distorted the original purpose of the UNDERSTANDING between the Powers and overlooked ITS STIPULATIONS REGARDING THE CONSENT OF THE POPULATIONS CONCERNED and the safeguarding of their interests"? How could Jemal, maliciously or otherwise have DISTORTED THE ORIGINAL PURPOSE of an "understanding between the Powers" arrived at as a result of secret "provisional exchanges and conversations" held in the early days of the War? Incredible as it may seem, the British Government's device to throw dust in the Shereef's eyes by representing Jemal's proposals as a Turkish ruse, was an unqualified success. Poor Hussein, such was his faith in English standards of fair dealing that he was unable to see through the British Government's blatantly transparent hoax, and having swallowed the lie whole he set his mind at rest and went on with the War.

* * *

Almost simultaneously with the disclosures from Petrograd came similar and equally sinister revelations from London where, since the promulgation on November 2, of the Balfour Declaration, enthusiastic mass meetings were being harangued by Sir Mark Sykes and Sir Herbert Samuel amidst great rejoicing in the Jew-controlled "British" Press. It is important to remember that while the official publication in London of Balfour's Declaration was made an occasion for general rejoicing, the British Government who had all along concealed from their Arab partners the very existence of the Declaration, now omitted even to apprise them of its promulgation, and merely ignored them, hoping the Arabs would not find out until their services in the field were no longer required. But they did find out, and at a time when their active cooperation was never more urgently needed.

In Cairo, where the news first leaked out, a storm of indignation galvanised the Arab leaders into active hostility, and despite a rigorous censorship and a highly resourceful propaganda service, the British authorities had great difficulty in appeasing their misgivings and in forestalling the disaffection of Hussein's supporters, and preventing the consequent collapse of the Arab Revolt.

In Syria, Lord Allenby acting under orders from Downing Street, assiduously suppressed any news concerning the Balfour Declaration

which was rightly regarded by the inhabitants as a refutation of Arab political freedom in Palestine. Theoretically, a Government thus jeopardised must succumb to the political upheaval which the exposure of such a colossal fraud usually provokes. But Mr. Lloyd George's caucus was impervious to criticism and could afford to take chances which no sane Government would dare to envisage. To overcome this new impasse the British Cabinet had recourse to what had become its accepted method of dealing with the Arabs, namely mendacity.

When King Hussein heard of the Balfour Declaration he was profoundly shocked and appealed to Sir Reginald Wingate for precise information regarding its terms. The British reply was characteristic and in strict conformity with its predecessors. To allay Arab fears and prevent a collapse of the Revolt it was decided to deceive Hussein with a totally spurious version of the Balfour Declaration in which the text was so falsified as to render it entirely inoccuous to Arab interests. The delicate task of thus hoodwinking the aged King was entrusted to Mr. David George Hogarth, archaeologist and curator of the Ashmolean Museum, and now a leading light in the Arab-Bureau, Cairo.

It was customary during the War to give a certain official standing to civilian employees at the Base by granting them temporary Naval or Military rank, and so Mr. D. G. Hogarth became Commander Hogarth. R. N., and as such arrived in Jedda early in January 1918 and was received twice by the King who was duly impressed and completely taken in by the personality and apparent veracity of the bearded Arabic speaking "naval" ambassador.

The official message from the Foreign Office which Hogarth was careful to deliver verbally and not in writing, was a deliberate falsehood designed to reassure Hussein and thus to save the Revolt from collapse. It amounted to a categorical disavowal of the Balfour Declaration and a wholly mendacious refutation of the terms adversely affecting Arab independence. Hogarth actually gave the Shereef an explicit assurance in the name of the British Government that Jewish immigration into Palestine would be permitted only SUBJECT TO THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC LIBERTY OF THE ARAB POPULATION, whereas in fact the Balfour Declaration guarantees ONLY THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS RIGHTS of the Arabs.

By substituting their own fictitious version of the Balfour Declaration for the real one, the British Government took the sting out of it and virtually annulled it,—the difference between the true and the false was

the difference between peace and civil war in Palestine. Had the Balfour Declaration really guaranteed the political and economic freedom of the Arabs as Commander Hogarth solemnly averred that it did, the Shereef Hussein would have done everything possible to facilitate equitable Jewish immigration and to promote peaceful cooperation between the two races: in fact he gave Hogarth an explicit assurance to that effect and also agreed to give cordial support to any measures which would ensure the safety and adequate control of the Holy Places, Christian, Moslem and Jewish, by their respective devotees, but he made it abundantly clear that he would never brook any interference with the Arab claim to absolute sovereignty, although he would gladly consider any reasonable proposals for appointing British or French technical and administrative advisors to the future Arab Government in Syria, including of course, Palestine.

The initial dismay and subsequent spontaneous reaction of the Arabs following the exposure and denial of the Sykes–Picot treaty, were re-enacted in the case of the Balfour Declaration. Dumbfounded at first, Hussein and his sons, as honourable men and loyal friends, refused to be swayed until they had heard the result of their appeal to their British partner for an explanation and for guidance. Hogarth's brazen-faced dementi completely fooled Hussein, who during the ensuing months continued to evince his unshakable loyalty and sincerity of purpose. He informed his followers in Egypt that he had received explicit assurances from the British Government that Arab independence in Palestine would not be affected by Jewish immigration, and he entreated them not to lose faith in Great Britain's pledge and not to slacken their own efforts to attain national liberty. He commanded his sons to exert themselves to the utmost, alleviating the restlessness and concern caused among their followers by the Balfour Declaration. An article written by himself appeared in his official organ *Mecca*, reminding the Palestinian Arabs that their religion, no less than their national traditions exact hospitality and tolerance to all including the Jews, with whom he enjoined the Arabs to cooperate for their mutual benefit. This article not only reflects his own freedom from religious or racial bias, but clearly defines Arab policy with regard to the Jews before the advent of political Zionism.

In Egypt the Balfour Declaration was being successfully explained away by the British authorities, where in March 1918 Dr. Weizmann arrived in Cairo at the head of a Zionist Commission to put the finishing touches to the work of appeasement. Assiduously supported by *Major*

the Hon. W. G. A. Ormsby-Gore (now Lord Harlech) appointed political officer to the Commission, by the Foreign Office Dr. Weizmann gave full vent to his rhetorical powers, and so completely hoodwinked the Arabs that he not only dispelled their fears but actually induced them to support him by advocating Zionist–Arab "cooperation." Moslems and Zionists attended meetings held under the auspices of the Commission, and so mesmerised were the Arab leaders by Weizmann's and Ormsby-Gore's mellifluous duplicity that one of their number, an original member of the oldest Syrian nationalist society, Dr. Faris Nimr Pasha, proprietor of *al-Muqattam*, one of the best known daily papers in Cairo, brought the whole weight of his influential journal in support of a Jewish–Arab entente!!

* * *

In the spring of 1918 when the Anglo–Arab alliance had been strained to breaking point by the disclosures of the Sykes–Picot Treaty and the Balfour Declaration, seven influential Arab notables living in Cairo who had all along been ardent supporters of the Revolt and were fully conversant with every detail of its history, decided to make a determined effort to clear up the situation. Accordingly they addressed a memorial to the British Government plainly setting out their own case and requesting an equally lucid and comprehensive definition of Great Britain's intentions towards the Arabs, particularly with regard to the form and nature of the Governments to be set up in Syria, Palestine and Iraq after the War. At a special meeting held at Army Headquarters in Cairo, the long awaited reply from the Foreign Office was formally delivered to the seven petitioners by Mr. Walrond of the Intelligence Service who informed them that a copy of this official statement had been dispatched to King Hussein.

In the "Declaration to the Seven" as this Foreign Office communiqué was dubbed, the British Government confirmed their previous assurances to the Arabs in less ambiguous terms than in any former public statement, and explicitly defined the principles upon which those promises were founded. Moreover they recognised the entire area claimed by Hussein, without any territorial reservations, as the dominion of Arab sovereign independence, and made it abundantly clear that their policy towards the inhabitants of Syria, Palestine and Iraq was that the oppressed peoples in those territories should be

liberated from Turkish rule and should obtain their freedom and independence, and that their future government should be based upon the principle of the consent of the governed, a principle to which, they averred, it would always be their policy to adhere. Furthermore the British Government solemnly promised that no formal Government would ever be established in Syria, Palestine or Iraq which was not acceptable to their inhabitants.

The publication of this affirmation was closely followed by that of President Wilson's Mount Vernon address of July 4, 1918 which corroborated the principles propounded in the Declaration to the Seven by declaring that the post-war settlement would be based upon "the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned." The doctrine of self determination ennunciated by both the British and American Governments has since proved to be a fallacy, and the "Declaration to the Seven" was no more than a mendacious denial of the British Government's duplicity, but Hussein took both at their face value and passed them on to the Emir Feisal for dissemination among his followers, whose sullen despondency immediately changed to the wildest enthusiasm as the purport of this Anglo-American pronouncement became generally known. The fact that these pledges were given after the Sykes-Picot and Balfour exposures greatly accentuated their significance in the eyes of the Arabs and stimulated the forces of the Revolt to prosecute the campaign with renewed vigour.

* * *

When on October 8, 1918 the first British troops entered Beirut they found that five days previously the Arab national flag had been hoisted in Feisal's name as the symbol of Arab sovereignty. The French strongly objected to this and remonstrated with General Allenby, at whose orders the flag was struck. The peremptory removal of their national emblem with all that it signified had so incensed Arab public opinion in Damascus and throughout Syria, that Feisal had the greatest difficulty in averting a general rising and even a mutiny among his own troops. Things became worse when it was learned that Beirut and the other Syrian ports were to be occupied by the French, and were still further aggravated by reports of Zionist machinations in Palestine. As a result of the disquieting information culled from Turkish sources during

the latter part of the War and imparted to the newly arrived Forces of the Revolt by their fellow countrymen in Damascus and Aleppo, Feisal's lieutenants were beginning to doubt the veracity of British professions and were gravely suspicious of Allied intentions. Fearing that a political storm would sweep the country, and in order to avert a disaster, Feisal protested to General Allenby and warned him that the situation had become so critical that he was losing control of his forces and would not hold himself responsible for what might occur unless the Allies immediately made an authoritative, unambiguous and straightforward statement regarding their intentions. Once more their own perfidy had brought the Entente face to face with disaster and again they extricated themselves by fraudulent misrepresentation.

On November 7, 1918, only four days before the Armistice, an official communiqué known as the Anglo–French Declaration was hurriedly issued to the Press by the British military authorities for general distribution throughout Syria, Palestine and Iraq. A determined effort was made to reach all sections of the community throughout the length and breadth of the Arab countries, in the remotest rural districts as well as in every town and hamlet. In deference to pressure from France, whose prestige, she pretended had suffered when Feisal's banner was hoisted at Beirut, this Declaration was published in French and with France as the senior partner mentioned first throughout the text, of which the following is a translation.

"The sole object of France and Great Britain in prosecuting in this eastern theatre the War initiated by German ambition, is the complete and final liberation of the peoples who have for so long oppressed by the Turks, and the setting up of national governments and administrations which will derive their authority from the free exercise of the initiative and choice of the indigenous populations. With these intentions uppermost in their minds, France and Great Britain agree to promote and assist in the setting up of native governments and administrations in these parts of Syria and Mesopotamia already liberated by the Allies, as well as in the territories which they are still trying to liberate, and to recognise those governments as soon as they are established.

Far from desiring to impose any particular political system upon the populations of those regions, the only concern of France and Great Britain is to offer such effective support and assistance as will ensure the smooth working of whatever form of government and administration

those populations will have chosen of their own free will; to secure impartial and equal justice for all; to facilitate the economic development of the country by promoting and encouraging local initiative; to foster the spread of education, and finally to put an end to the dissensions which Turkish policy have for so long exploited. Such is the task which the two Allied Powers desire to undertake in the liberated territories."

* * *

In this self righteous rigmarole the Allies stress the single-mindedness of their motives and represent themselves as being merely the disinterested guardians of the future self-determined and self-governing Arab States. That they did this is not surprising in view of their previous record for political knavery, but that the Shereef Hussein and other Arab leaders should have fallen headlong into the trap would be inexplicable, especially after recent experiences, unless it is remembered that the primitive simplicity and insularity of Arab social conditions, no less than the innate ingenuousness of the Arabs themselves rendered them incapable of acquiring even an elementary insight into the real significance of politics as understood in the west, which as Frederick the Great remarked, are almost synonymous with villainy, a qualification which no longer applies to the political conspiracies of the twentieth century.

The effect of the Anglo–French Declaration was instantaneous, and within a few days the impending storm had blown over. Like its predecessors this Declaration proclaimed the doctrine of government by consent of the governed, and like them it came at a critical moment in the nick of time to avert a rupture between Great Britain and her Arab Allies. Four days after the promulgation of the Anglo–French Declaration came the Armistice and with it the final collapse of the Ottoman Empire, as a result of which the Sultan's Arab Provinces became the possessions of France and Great Britain. Thus ended the dream of Arab sovereign independence.

PART III

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES

CHAPTER IX

THE SECOND BATTLE OF MEGIDDO

IN spite of Allenby's victorious campaign, this last invasion of Palestine achieved no more for Britain than did any of its predecessors for the Crusaders; but whereas these latter failed because their campaigns were abortive, Britain had to forego the fruits of victory because a craven and corrupt Government had mortgaged them to its paymasters, the Jews. Consequently Allenby's troops fought to their own detriment, for an alien oligarchy to whom they had been sold, and at whose behest and for whose material advantage Britain had surrendered the heritage of Empire.

* * *

Unlike nearly every other great soldier in the British Army, Lord Allenby, who during the whole of his distinguished career had never served in India or in the East, had not come into contact with Orientals of any description. For this very reason he had, when commanding the Third Army in France, made it quite clear to Lord Haig that he would never willingly accept a command in the East as he did not consider himself suited for it and it did not appeal to him. During the heavy fighting near Arras early in 1917 Lord Allenby's honesty of purpose and brilliant leadership caused not a little jealousy and considerable fluttering in the dovecots at General Headquarters, Allenby did not always see eye to eye with the All-Highest and his favourites and made no bones about telling them so, besides giving them an ocular demonstration at the Battle of Arras of the soundness of his methods. As a result of this and in order to remove a dangerous rival to a safe distance, Lord Haig was prevailed upon to nominate him to the command of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force, much to the sorrow of all who had been privileged to serve under him in France. As the direct result of hostile intrigues at G.H.Q. therefore, this appointment was more in the nature of a reprimand than a distinction, but subsequent events turned the tables on the conspirators.

Under Allenby the Egyptian Expeditionary Force took a new lease of life, pushing on from one victory to another until, on September 19, 1918 it launched its last and greatest offensive, which shares the honour of being one of the most perfect classical battles of the Great

War. Allenby's victory at Megiddo which stands very high among all the great things achieved by either side in the greatest of all wars, was a campaign such as every soldier dreams of, but very few have realised.

Up to the very last minute the German Commander-in-Chief in Syria, Liman von Sanders, was convinced that the attack was coming from the British right wing, and nothing was overlooked that might help to further this impression. Apart from the concentration of troops both real and dummy, and numerous feints in the Jordon Valley, official secrets were disseminated to the effect that Allenby's Headquarters were about to move to Jerusalem, where a display of Headquarter flags and "brass hats" helped to confirm the rumour. The Turks had captured an officer's patrol with orders relating to the forthcoming attack against the Turkish left wing, and the Commander-in-Chief's wife, Lady Allenby was kept busy in Cairo sending out invitations for a banquet which Lord Allenby had asked her to arrange, and which he expressed his intention of coming down from Palestine to attend; the invited guests and Lady Allenby herself having no suspicion that the preparations for the banquet and her husband's announced visit to Cairo were intended solely for the benefit of enemy spies, who little dreamed that instead of presiding at dinner on that date, General Allenby would be launching an attack which was to break the Turkish Empire. This battle is unique in that its opening phase was actually witnessed by two distinguished ladies, specially invited by the Commander in Chief.

Both Lady Allenby and Mrs. Hampson Gary, the wife of the American Diplomatic Agent in Cairo, were spectators at Allenby's Headquarters in the field on the first few days of the fighting, although Mrs. Hampson Gary very nearly missed this unique opportunity by delaying her departure from Cairo on a visit to Palestine of which she very little realised the importance, as the many telegrams of invitation received by her did not, for obvious reasons, give her any clue to the nature of the "entertainment."

Part of Allenby's preparations for the battle had consisted in the close study of all the campaigns that had ever been waged over this, the oldest battle-field in the world. Having studied every historical account of the battles of the ancient Egyptians and Romans, he selected as his model the campaign waged by Pharoah Necho in B. C. 608 (graphically described in the Bible) culminating in a decisive victory at Megiddo, a tiny mountain village commanding the main pass to the plains of Armageddon, and this same spot, over twenty five centuries

later, was the key to Allenby's plan of attack, and the scene of the greatest rout the Turks ever sustained.

By the morning of September 18, the concentration of British forces in the coastal plain was completed. It had been carried out by night, every precaution being taken to prevent the movement becoming apparent to the Turks, and full use being made of the many orange and olive groves to conceal the troops during the day. In the early hours of September 19, the headquarters of the Turkish Armies were bombed by aeroplanes, and at 4.30 a.m. the artillery opened an intense bombardment, under cover of which the infantry left their positions an hour later; and by a quarter past six three divisions of cavalry began to pour through the gap made by the 60th (London) Division which had attacked the extreme right of the Turkish line on the coast. Within thirty six hours the Eighth Turkish Army had been overwhelmed and the Seventh, Commanded by Mustapha Kemal Pasha (the future Kemal Ataturk) was in full retreat, but as all the exits were already in the hands of Allenby's cavalry, practically the whole of these two Armies were captured with all their guns and transport.

The German Commander-in-Chief, Liman von Sanders, just managed to slip away in time, but his papers and some of his staff were taken in the Yilderim General Headquarters at Nazareth. Great confusion reigned in the Turkish rear. Camps and hospitals were being hurriedly evacuated; some were in flames. The roads were congested with transport and troops, and the disorganisation which already existed was increased by the repeated attacks of the Air Force. Great quantities of transport and numerous guns were abandoned by the roadsides. Near Khirbet Ferweh, on one stretch of road under 5 miles in length were found 87 guns, 55 motor lorries and 932 vehicles.

On September 20, the Turkish defence was definitely broken, and by the following day all organised resistance had ceased. As the result of this the Fourth Turkish Army, now threatened from all sides, retreated and was attacked and pursued, chiefly by Arab regulars and tribesmen, to Damascus where its exhausted remnants were captured, and on October 26, the cavalry occupied Aleppo.

On the opening day of the battle the Turkish fighting forces amounted to 4,000 cavalry, 32,000 infantry and 400 guns, which Allenby attacked with 12,000 cavalry, 57,000 infantry and 540 guns. By October 29, the British losses in killed, wounded, missing and injured were only 339 officers and 5,400 other ranks, excluding Australian and New Zealand

troops. Allenby's actual "Killed in Battle" casualties amounted in all to only 500.

That this decisive victory was achieved with such little loss of life to both sides was due almost entirely to the Royal Flying Corps. From the morning of September 19, to the evening of September 25, the deciding factor in the battle was undoubtedly the British Air Arm. The Ottoman troops retiring in good order through the hills had at various places to defile through narrow gorges, on reaching which they were subjected to incessant and merciless attacks from the air. By September 25, the Seventh and Eighth Turkish Armies were reduced to a swarm of fugitives who were comparatively safe so long as they kept to the hills, but all their guns, supplies and transport on the roads were destroyed or captured.

The contrast in the physical conditions of the two armies was very marked. The British were healthy and fit, having had the advantage of every care that modern science and sound organisation could contrive, and had been trained to perform feats of endurance even to doing without water for long periods. The Turks on the other hand, were suffering from the results of neglect and continued privation amounting almost to starvation, in addition to which the ravages of malignant malaria had further reduced their strength; so deplorable was their condition that by far the greater number of prisoners were found to be suffering from acute tracoma.

Three days after the first attack the Turkish Army ceased to exist, and never rallied to make another stand. Across the plain of Esdralon through Damascus and Aleppo, for 300 miles they were pursued relentlessly; 75,000 were captured together with 360 guns and the entire transport and equipment of three armies. The remainder struggled on, a beaten rabble, to find a sanctuary in Asia Minor.

* * *

It had already become known that General Townsend who had been a prisoner since the fall of Kut, had been liberated by the Turks in order to negotiate peace terms. Townsend accompanied by Tewfik Pasha went to Mudros where the two were received by Admiral Sir Somerset Calthorpe, Commanding the Allied Fleet in the Mediterranean. Calthorpe informed Tewfik Pasha that he was empowered to inform fully accredited Turkish plenipotentiaries of the conditions under which

the Allies would agree to an Armistice. Tewfik agreeing, a British cruiser was sent to bring the plenipotentiaries with whom conferences began on October 26, and on October 30, during the height of a terrific storm, the Armistice was signed on board the Flag-Ship *Lord Nelson*, Admiral Calthorpe himself being the sole signatory for the Allies.

On October 31, barely six weeks after the first attack, Allenby was informed by telegram that the Naval Commander-in-Chief had already concluded an Armistice with Turkey to start at noon that day. In this astounding manner did the victorious general hear of the cessation of hostilities. At that time he was virtually dictator over the whole of Turkey, Syria and Egypt, as well as the adjacent states of Arabia, but his Authority being purely a military one and the business of war being at an end, he proceeded to consolidate his position and waited for instructions. These never came; and he was left high and dry to shoulder the full responsibilities of intricate civil administration and muddled international politics without the slightest indication of the course he was expected to follow.

At that time British military prestige was at its highest, and the war-weary population welcomed the victorious army as the symbol of a new era of peace and plenty. Genuine pleasure and relief were visible on all sides, not because the Turk had been hated or even disliked, but because the long nightmare of devastating war was over at last. It always happens that sudden relief coming after a prolonged period of tension and sustained effort, produces violent reaction which in this case had the effect of magnifying the British occupation into the dawn of the millennium. The country at once felt itself to be part of the British Empire and imagined that all the blessings of Utopia would follow in the wake of the army. As was only natural, these great expectations caused a constant desire for an outward and visible sign of the blessings of British rule. Lord Allenby at the head of a large army in a country devoid of any sort of Government was looked upon as a dictator by the inhabitants who welcomed him as such, hoping he would put their house in order and steer them back to normal conditions. The greatest wish of the population was to forget the War and be governed. They were prepared to welcome any form of stable Government and were willing to obey any laws theirrulers might have imposed, having the greatest faith in the administrative wisdom and impartial justice of Britain, who, they fully expected would develop the country’s resources and open its markets to British trade. They had

existed for centuries in an atmosphere of stagnation and decay under the easy-going haphazard rule of the Turk, whose demise, they thought would be followed by an era of prosperity. It was expected that martial law would be abolished at once and that commercial intercourse with neighbouring and other states would be encouraged, and that British enterprise would quickly find means of making the country defray the cost of the campaign.

Weeks and months passed in nerve-racking uncertainty the effects of which were becoming unbearable. The Arabs were clamouring for large tracts of country which had been promised to them, but which it was afterwards discovered had previously been assigned to the French under the secret Sykes–Picot Treaty. Christians, Moslems and Jews were shouting for self-determination without the vaguest idea of what the term implied. The French were intriguing through their numerous Roman Catholic Missions which, ostensibly purely religious, were in reality semi-political and partly commercial. Interference with the vested interests of religion by the military or civil power is always a delicate proposition, but as a result of the hostility of French nuns at Haifa, actively supported by all their Roman Catholic confederates, conditions were becoming intolerable, and it became imperative to apply an effective antidote to this particularly virulent type of political intrigue. However, the remedy, though efficacious was humiliating, as it was applied at Lord Allenby's own request, by the Church of Rome itself in the form of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Bourne, who having obtained the Papal sanction came out to Palestine and immediately checked the anti-British activities of the various religious bodies by placing the English Father Lamb at the head of the Carmelite monks and dealing with the other monasteries and convents in such a way that matters had improved considerably before His Eminence left the country.

Conditions generally were phenomenal. The Turks had fled bag and baggage, but there was none to take their place. For centuries they had ruled, administered the law, provided officials, an army and police, and now they were gone, leaving nothing but a legacy of famine and disease. Up to the time of the last great battle the country was divided into two widely contrasting halves. The southern portion extending right up to Allenby's front line, had prospered under British occupation and was free of disease. The northern part beginning from the Turkish trenches, only a few yards distant from the British, was a hotbed of

infection. Allenby realised before the battle that success depended upon the rapidity with which the Turk could be annihilated, as his Medical officers had warned him that only ten days would elapse before the ravages of malaria would decimate his troops after they left their own clean trenches.

The moment the attacking British troops crossed into the Turkish area they became infected with malignant malaria, which ten days later took such devastating effect that had not the Turks already been rendered *hors de combat*, they could have rallied and held their own against their enfeebled pursuers. The regions under British occupation had not only been freed from disease, but had become rich beyond the dreams of avarice, owing to the fact that regular and extensive purchases as well as labour had always been paid for lavishly in British gold. On the other hand the northern, or Turkish portion of Syria had been reduced to starvation partly by the depredations of the army, but chiefly owing to the "cornering" of food and other supplies by the Turkish Commander-in-Chief Ahmed Jemal Pasha, and some of the wealthy Syrian notables such as the Sursocks and Lotfallahs, who made considerable fortunes at the expense of the army and the civil population.

Ever since the inception of the *Entente Cordiale* [signed 1904], the policy of dancing to French music had been rigidly adhered to. As a result of a suggestion put forward by the Governor-General of the French Sudan that in order to allay French irritation over the Kitchener–Marchand incident, the ill-omened name Fashoda should disappear from the map, Lord Cromer ordered that the name Kodok should be promptly and permanently substituted for Fashoda! A Treaty concluded during the XVII century between the French King and the Sultan of Turkey stipulated that all merchandise carried between France and Turkish ports in the Mediterranean should be borne, if not always in French ships, then in ships flying the French flag. Accordingly when British ships were sent up to Beirut from Egypt laden with wheat and other foodstuffs for the starving Syrians, the French protested on the grounds that an opportunity for establishing their prestige should be afforded them, by allowing the ships to sail under the Tricolor, and deliver their cargoes as a gift from France. This impudent whim was generously granted, and British ships with British cargoes, paid for by British gold, sailed into Beirut under the French flag, and bestowed their bounteous gifts in the name of France. The French argued that as their

armies had fought for the Allies in France during the War, it was only right that they should reap their full share of the spoils in Syria, although they had not been able to spare more than a handful of troops to assist in the work. Nothing was too good for the French, whose slightest fancy, however capricious, was pandered to and gratified. British troops had taken the country and were holding it; British money and labour were reorganising and reconstructing it, while France was preparing to take over a going concern free of charge. French commercial travellers disguised as soldiers applied for and were granted every facility to visit the Holy Land, where, secure in the immunity of their uniforms, they were free to hawk their wares and capture the markets for the French firms they represented.

Palestine was overrun with U.S. Standard Oil agents thinly disguised as Red Cross workers, a subterfuge which was particularly abnoxious to Allenby whose efforts to expose it however were not entirely successful owing to the fact that at the head of the American Red Cross was the Jew Davison, one of the head partners in Morgan's Bank, the Allies' principal creditor in the U.S.A.!

A claim was put forward by France and accepted by Britain without demur, to the right of priority as Warden of Roman Catholic interests in Jerusalem and Bethlehem, an office with which it was difficult to reconcile the dis-establishment of the Church in France. Nevertheless, at the first official celebration of Midnight Mass after the War in Bethlehem on Christmas Eve 1918, Colonel Storrs, the British Governor of Jerusalem, took a back seat while the French representatives Georges Picot and Colonel de Meru scintillated the pomp of, and received the homage due to, their honourable and pious office.

Palestine was in the unique position of having untold money to burn and nothing to burn it on. Not only had every man, woman and child found lucrative employment during the War, but the army of occupation had been a gold mine. Striking proof of the wealth of the country could be seen at the weekly auctions held by the British authorities to dispose of captured enemy horses, mules and donkeys, which invariably attracted the keenest bidding from out-at-heel villagers who would think themselves lucky to get an inferior mule for £40, or a small donkey for £8 or £10, and pay the price in English gold sovereigns. Apart from these auctions there was nothing for them to spend their money on, and a rich harvest awaited any enterprising merchant prepared to supply

the wants of a population who lacked the bare necessities of life but were wealthy enough to afford luxuries at any price had these been procurable. However, the blockade of Germany after the Armistice had its counterpart in Palestine which was completely blockaded under Martial Law and by “Occupied Enemy Territory Administration,” an offshoot of General Headquarters, generally known as “O.E.T.A.” with branches in every principal centre. No civilians or goods were allowed to enter or leave, no business of any description could be done, and even simple transactions in house property were held up because the law of the land was in abeyance, rendering contracts null and void. In fact everything was in abeyance, pending the expected advent of something new to replace the old, but nothing new was forthcoming, and the continual uncertainty caused a cloud of depression, disappointment and restlessness to settle on everyone. Soon after the Armistice it became evident that graft in its worst form was rampant among officials of O.E.T.A. (Occupied Enemy Territory Administration) not a few of whom were Jews, and these succeeded in making a very handsome pile both in Palestine and later on in Egypt. The blockade invested the officials responsible for its administration with absolute control of all traffic between Palestine and the outside world, and hence with a commercial monopoly of which the advantages were unlimited. The O.E.T.A. official who wished to make a fortune within the shortest possible time found himself in the unique position of being able to administer the law and the customs, levy taxes, control the market and exclude all competition, that he himself might enjoy the sole right of importing and selling goods. An abnormally high purchasing power combined with a total lack of every necessity of life immediately turned Palestine into the smuggler’s El Dorado and the unscrupulous official’s paradise.

Egyptian merchants had to pay fabulous sums to officials of O.E.T.A. for illegal permits to import strictly limited consignments of wheat and rice into Palestine which was destitute, and where food could be sold at a premium although the Egyptian ports were congested with stocks of wheat, rice and other foodstuffs which their owners were only too anxious to sell at any price. Export permits were actually obtainable in Cairo through junior Chancellery officials at the British Residency.

A particularly lucrative business was done in crude alcohol for which the proprietors of drinking dens in Jaffa, Jerusalem and Haifa gladly paid fabulous prices. Extortionate fees were paid to confederates of

O.E.T.A. officials in Cairo for permits to export the crudest and cheapest alcohol packed in tins, the price of which was maintained at the highest level in Palestine by stringent control of supplies. As much as £1,000 net profit was realised by a Jewish O.E.T.A. officer at Jerusalem and his associates on a single railway truckload of crude alcohol sent up from Egypt on an O.E.T.A. permit and sold for cash in a siding at the Goods' Station in Jerusalem.

This corruption of British officers surprised those who had heard so much of British integrity, and was the direct cause of a considerable proportion of the country's misfortunes. Other causes of discontent were the senseless trials of war-criminals, and ex-enemy malefactors who may or may not have been the greatest scoundrels unhung, but it was felt that the energy, time and money devoted to catching the culprits and subjecting them to long-winded and often fruitless trials, would have been better devoted to a more practical purpose. There would have been general satisfaction had the British authorities rounded up the real criminals, those wealthy Syrian commercial families such as the Sursocks and Lotfallahs, who amassed fortunes by cornering wheat while thousands died of starvation, but to set up endless trials on insignificant wretches was deemed merely childish, and hampering the work of reconstruction.

Scattered over Palestine and Syria were many German colonies, founded in 1886 by German settlers whose religion was markedly stronger than their patriotism, but later generations have become less religious and very patriotic. In the decade preceding the War the German community was quite typically German, and its influence was very marked, the commerce and industry of the country being largely in its hands. Their villages were entirely self contained and self supporting and were models of up to date methods in interior economy. The best educational establishments and agricultural colleges were German and nearly all the European Consulates and shipping agencies were in their hands. They were very strongly anti-Jewish. At the time of the British occupation, when as already explained the country lay under the pall of a moratorium, without any civil administration and with no legal machinery other than Martial Law, and no currency, real estate became valueless and all dealings in land and house property were entirely: suspended,—a chaotic state of affairs of which the Jews were quick to take advantage. As a result of insidious Jewish propaganda the German settlers greatly feared British reprisals, and a number of them

sold their holdings to the Jews for a song and fled the country in the belief, fostered by the same Jews, that their property would be confiscated and themselves deported. The majority, however, remained in subdued anticipation, but as time wore on and nothing untoward happened, their confidence returned together with a self assurance which evinced a certain contempt. Little incidents in every day life often serve to show the trend of public opinion, and Lord Allenby had an experience which greatly impressed him at the time.

He was returning from his customary afternoon ride accompanied by an Aide de Camp, and the two were riding down the centre of the Kaiserstrasse, the main thoroughfare in the German quarter of Haifa. At that moment the only other people within sight were three little German girls aged about twelve, coming from the opposite direction, walking arm in arm down the centre of the street. There was plenty of room not only in the road, but on either pathway, but the children walked straight ahead at a brisk pace towards the riders until they were right under the horses heads, and it was only by pulling out sharply at the last minute that Lord Allenby and his Aide de Camp avoided riding over the girls, who were obviously delighted at having forced the British Commander-in-Chief to make way for them. An incident, trifling in itself, but far more eloquent than words. Taken altogether however, the Germans kept aloof and gave no trouble.

* * *

Besides Germans, the population of Palestine consisted mainly of Jews, Levantines, Syrians and Arabs. The Jews were divided into two main groups, the Sephardi and the Ashkenazi communities, the former being the orthodox Biblical fanatics, while the latter are mostly Yiddish speaking immigrants. The two had been in age long rivalry but were then uniting. There were many Jewish so-called “agricultural stations” all over Palestine, but they were only names for Jewish colonies and could not have existed had they not been heavily subsidised by patrons such as Baron Edmund de Rothschild who founded and endowed the most important ones. Agriculture does not appeal to the Jew in Palestine any more than it does elsewhere, but for political reasons a great show was made by these subsidised “agricultural stations,” which were indispensable for window dressing purposes.

The Levantines are a nondescript mongrel race of Christians, of which the ingredients are mainly Greek, Italian, Jew and Syrian. They are engaged entirely in business and bureaucracy. The real natives of Palestine are the Syrians, although they too are mongrels, among whom the Moslems are known locally as Arabs and the Christians as Syrians. At that time the vast majority 82 per cent of the population consisted of Syrians (650,000 Moslems and 75,000 Christians), who are generally referred to in Europe as Arabs. The real Arabs, locally called Bedouin, are small nomad tribes from Arabia, living in tents and doing manual work of all descriptions. A few have settled in scattered villages.

The racial difficulties, bad as they were, faded into insignificance before the maze of religious and political intrigue. Broadly speaking, religion and politics went hand in hand in so far as the two main divisions were concerned, Jews and anti-Jews, the latter, including Moslems and Christians, although divided and subdivided into innumerable political and religious sects, would at the first sign of impending danger, sink their respective internal differences, and form a united Moslem front against Christians or vice versa; while the strongest link between Moslem and Christian was their intense mutual hatred of the Jew. The chief anti-Jewish organisations were:—The Christian–Moslem Society, The Arabic–Anglophile Society, and the Shereefian Society, all of which had a very strong following.

The supporters of France were the papist Maronites in the Lebanon and the Melchites, while Russia had her followers in the Orthodox community, and Britain among her old friends the Druzes. The Moslems who formed the overwhelming majority of the population had remained unaffected by foreign political intrigue.

A few days respite from religious and political bickering was afforded by the general rejoicing at the news of the cessation of hostilities. On November 10, the following news summary was issued by the Intelligence branch at General Headquarters in Palestine:—

“The revolution is spreading in Western Germany and is in full swing in Berlin, the Reds occupy a great part of the city. It is reported that Leipzig, Stuttgart, Frankfort and Cologne have joined the revolution. A Bavarian Republic was proclaimed in Munich today. This morning at 7.30 the Kaiser, the Crown Prince and an old man, recognised as Hindenburg, and practically all the German Staff, crossed the Dutch frontier at Eysdon, going to Count Bentinck’s *château* at Middachston.”

On November 11, it was reported :—

"The Press Bureau announces that an armistice with Germany was signed at 5 o'clock this morning to come into force at 11 a.m."

There was general rejoicing on receipt of this news, and after much cheering and indiscriminate displays of fireworks consisting of rockets, Verey lights and explosives obtained from convenient ammunition dumps, the British Army settled down again and went about its business, while attention was once more focussed on politics and the future of the country.

On November 12, Colonel Sir Mark Sykes, Bart. M.P. expert adviser on "the Hast" arrived at Lord Allenby's Headquarters, having been sent from England by the Foreign Office to enquire into and report on the general state of affairs in the Near East. He was accompanied by a Major Chamberlain whose duty it was to assist and advise him. This extraordinary couple were modern reincarnations of Don Quixote and his henchman Sancho Panza; their appearance, fantastic ideas and eccentric behaviour all were typical of their famous prototypes.

Sykes' faithful henchman who had also been selected as an "expert" by the Foreign Office, was of ample figure and had a retiring and somnolent disposition. His claim to expert authority on Eastern matters was derived solely from the fact, that twelve years previously, he and his brother had been wintering in Egypt from where they took ship to Beirut, hired some mules and rode to Damascus and back, shooting quail on the way.

On November 14, two days after the arrival of Sir Mark Sykes, the notorious Georges Picot, now French Chargé d'Affaires in Syria, took up his residence in the political camp at Allenby's Headquarters. At that time Picot was causing considerable annoyance to the Commander-in-Chief who, in spite of the Frenchman's repeated attempts to evade his invitations, had insisted on his coming to and remaining at Headquarters, where his activities could be controlled. Reappointed to Beirut as the unofficial High Commissioner of France, Picot carried on every conceivable kind of intrigue in order to create a pro-French and anti-British political atmosphere favourable to the French occupation of Syria. This ardent Jesuit and Anglophobe was a thoroughgoing knave but also something of a fool. He would stick at nothing to further his schemes and went so far as to collect a party of Maronites (Roman Catholic Syrians) as unscrupulous as himself, who as a self-styled representative Syrian deputation, set sail for France with the intention

of appealing, on behalf of Syria, to the Peace Conference in Paris, for the immediate occupation of Syria by France. Unfortunately for them the British authorities got wind of the plot, and when the ship put into Port Said the conspirators were arrested and detained in Egypt.

In order to secure Hussein's cooperation, Great Britain had, as previously stated, mortgaged Palestine and Syria to the Arabs, and on top of this came the Balfour Declaration assigning Palestine to the Jews. It now fell to the lot of Lord Allenby to unravel the tangle caused by muddled diplomacy by which Syria became pledged to the French as well as to the Arabs, and Palestine to the Arabs and the Jews. On the principle that discretion is the better part of valour, it was decided to keep faith with France and the Jews at the expense of the Arabs. This was done by informing King Hussein that when Syria was promised him in 1916 nothing was known then of the Sykes–Picot Treaty because it was a secret one, and as it was concluded prior to the undertaking given to the Arabs, it automatically rendered the agreement with them as regards Syria, null and void, and at Lord Allenby's urgent request King Hussein's troops evacuated Beirut and Damascus in favour of France and withdrew to the interior of Syria to await developments. This was done on an explicit assurance given by Allenby to the Arab leader, the Emir Feisal, that Syria would remain garrisoned by British and not by French troops until a final settlement was reached at the Peace Conference. Having temporarily overcome this difficulty, both Sykes and Picot were called in by Lord Allenby to explain, if they could, the intricacies of their own secret treaty, which by reason of the liberal extent of its concessions to France, was causing considerable trouble.

Picot adopted a sullen non-committal attitude but was always up to some deceitful trickery; Sir Mark Sykes on the other hand had lost interest in his old treaty, and was devoting his meteoric impulsiveness to the salvation of the Armenians, a hobby with which he was temporarily obsessed. Secret diplomacy, always unsatisfactory, becomes positively dangerous in the hands of men like Sykes and Picot, whose unbalanced impetuosity on the one hand and unscrupulous scheming on the other caused endless trouble to their respective countries and untold harm to thousands of innocent victims, besides destroying the chances of a satisfactory solution to the problem of reconstructing the Middle East.

When in the summer of 1916, after the signing of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, Hussein openly declared for the Allies, he had not done so with a light heart or from uninspired motives. For over a year Great Britain had been urging the rulers in Arabia to rise against the Turks and although all had received arms and considerable sums of money, Hussein was the only one to fulfil his promise by becoming an active ally, but not before he had been definitely promised that the Arabs would attain unity and independence as the reward for their cooperation.

The Sykes–Picot treaty was in itself an effective bar to Arab unity, and in so far as Syria and Palestine were concerned rendered their independence impossible; and yet so anxious was the British Government to ensure the cooperation of the Arabs, that not only did it refrain from disclosing the existence of the secret treaty but actually promised to reward the Arabs with that which was no longer within its gift.

In the light of subsequent events it becomes increasingly clear that had the Arabs, who fought under Feisal's banner in Syria, been made aware that they were helping to expel the Turk in order that France and the Jews might step into his shoes, they would in all probability have chosen to fight for the Sultan.

A frequent visitor to Headquarters was Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the Jewish Agency and of the Zionist Association, the most potent international body in the world. A tall powerful built man with a striking facial resemblance to Lenin, Weizmann was indefatigable in his zeal for Zionism, and was not above trying to steal a march on Lord Allenby, whom he found a very tough nut to crack.

Another Jewish champion in the political camp at Headquarters was James de Rothschild, well known in French and British sporting circles, who in spite of his nationality was somewhat out of his element. His father had founded and endowed many of the most important Jewish colonies including Richon-le-Zion, one of the largest wine and spirit distilleries in the world, and "Jimmy" was a staunch Jew and conscientious to the extent of learning his own language, Hebrew, but he was too assimilated and could not bring himself to take much interest in the petty schemes and squabbles of a purely artificial "national movement."

* * *

In Palestine the Christians were divided into two main groups, the Roman Catholics and the Orthodox, with several minor branches patronised by one or other of the big churches. Among the smaller sects, the Greek Orthodox, the Armenians and the Copts were supported by the Orthodox Russian Church and nation, both spiritually and temporally, while the Church of Rome had the diplomatic and moral *appui* of France, Italy and Spain. Religion in the Holy Land has always been primarily a commercial enterprise, and this accounted for the amazing pious fervour displayed by the various churches with interests in Jerusalem and elsewhere. In Jerusalem the Churches are the landlords in their respective quarters of the town, of which the rent rolls, especially those from shops and warehouses are very considerable.

The Great Powers had been waiting for years, expecting the collapse of the Turkish Empire, and had secured a preliminary footing on the Sick Man's premises under the cloak of religion. During the centuries that the Turk was the custodian of the Holy Places of Christianity he derived substantial revenues from the rival Christian Churches and considerable bribes from jealous political and ecclesiastical bodies. He was nothing if not broadminded, and an example of Turkish good nature and adaptability (not to mention business acumen) was to be seen on the Mount of Olives, where a Moslem shrine surmounted a rock on which was the "genuine" footprint of Mahomet. For 364 days in the year, devout Moslem pilgrims would contribute their mite for the privilege of worshipping at the sacred spot, but the largest attendance and biggest "gate" was always secured on Ascension Day, when the guardian would fix a cross in place of the crescent on top of the shrine and admit the Christian pilgrims to worship where the footprint of their Saviour marked the spot where He had ascended into Heaven.

But the Turk was tolerant in his own country, and fully justified in deriving pecuniary advantage from the rapacious Christian invaders for whom and for whose so-called religion, he had the profoundest contempt. There was no similar excuse for the conduct of the churches who converted Jerusalem into the departmental store of Christianity, by exploiting the faith of their own ignorant followers. Not only were the monasteries themselves flourishing commercial concerns, but they were able to remit enormous annual revenues to their parent churches in Russia, Greece and Rome. In May 1919, the Greek Orthodox hierarchy in Jerusalem required a loan of no less than £500,000, and so far from there being any difficulty in obtaining this enormous sum,

there was considerable competition in financial circles for the privilege of providing it. The Bank of Athens amongst others, sending a special delegate to Jerusalem to negotiate terms.

The War did nothing to improve the low moral code existing between the various ecclesiastical bodies, who continued to perpetrate every conceivable crime, including murder, in the name of Christ. France derived considerable advantage from the numerous French religious institutions throughout Syria and Palestine, which were hotbeds of political intrigue. The military occupation of Syria by France was greatly resented by the inhabitants who were giving the French administration a deal of trouble, so much so that the Commandant at Damascus, Colonel Cousse, had to appeal for assistance to Allenby who made a special journey to the French Headquarters and gave peremptory orders that the military representatives of France were to be obeyed.

Time passed and still there was no manifest sign of any settled policy or even political intention on the part of the British Government, and as a result, the wildest rumours began to circulate and gain credence. At one moment it was said that the superior military power of France had compelled Britain to renounce her claims in Syria, at another that the Germans had prevented the seizure of Palestine by threatening reprisals in Europe, and also that Great Britain had sold the country to the Jews. Nothing was ever contradicted or confirmed at Headquarters for the very good reason that Lord Allenby was no wiser than anybody else as to the intentions of his Government, but it was supposed that the future of all the liberated countries was being discussed at the Peace Conference in Paris. On December 6, Lord Allenby left his headquarters at Bir Salem on a tour of inspection which included Aleppo and Adana. While he was away an incident occurred near his headquarters which was the subject of considerable comment at the time. The camp of an Australian Cavalry Brigade, whose headquarters were at Richon-le-Zion, was visited during the night by an Arab thief who on being detected by a trooper, fled toward the neighbouring village of Surafend closely pursued by the Australian whom the Arab shot and killed. The Arab escaped into the darkness, but the sound of the shot had roused the others who assumed from the direction he took, that the thief was a native of Surafend and it was not long before the Australians were swarming round the village; their procedure was quick and to the point. Some were stationed at every outled, whilst the others went into the village and called out the women and children

whom they allowed to pass unmolested, and as soon as this was done, a party of troopers armed with heavy cudgels, burst into the narrow streets and bludgeoned every man they could find until they had killed 18 and wounded many more; after which they set fire to the village while the whole brigade clustered round to watch the blaze.

On his return Lord Allenby was informed of what had happened within sight of his own headquarters, and he immediately ordered a parade of the whole brigade, and having told them in plain English what he thought of them, banished them then and there, to a barren country many miles distant, out of harm's way. The sequel was typical of those concerned. The Australians had held a race meeting at Richon, in which some of the events were open to British officers, one of whom, Lord George Cholmondeley, by winning two of the races, became entitled to receive stakes and prizes which included a silver cup, but the only competitors to get their dues were members of the Australian Brigade who, retained the stakes and took the cup away with them into exile.

Christmas 1918 came and went without any further developments in the situation, by which time the glamour had worn off Allenby's spectacular victory and nothing but disappointment remained; in certain sections of the community, it was felt that Turkish rule had many advantages which the British régime did not possess, and expressions of regret at the passing of the "good old days" were heard on all sides.

Three months had elapsed since the Turkish army was annihilated and much to their own astonishment, the Turks were still peacefully waiting in Constantinople for the conqueror who never came. Time is a great healer, and its soothing properties were not lost on the astute Osmanli who had in some measure recovered from the initial shock of disaster and was actually getting truculent again.

At this juncture it was decided to enforce the terms of the Armistice, and with instructions to that effect, Lord Allenby, on February 4, 1919 sailed from Palestine for Constantinople on board H. M.'s battleship *Temeraire*, accompanied only by a few of his personal staff.

Contrary to general expectation, no special mark of distinction was accorded him on his arrival in the Turkish capital, other than the usual salute from the British ships in port and a Scottish Guard of Honour at the quay. The French men o'war were festooned with their crews' vests and pants hanging out to dry, and those sailors on the ships of other nations who were not lying about the decks were too busy to notice the

Commander-in-Chief of the Allied armies, whose official entry into the enemy's capital consisted in a short motor drive from the landing stage to the British Embassy accompanied by the local Commander-in-Chief, General Milne, the staff, and one or two friends: no more, and no less.

On the following day the French General Franchet d'Esperey, who had not the remotest connection with the Turkish campaign, arrived in Constantinople in a battleship escorted by no less than a whole division of troops. At the time of his arrival and during his triumphal entry, Allenby was being conducted round the historical military museum in Stamboul by a soulful old Turkish General.

The French General was greeted by a thundering salute of 100 guns from the entire Allied Fleet as well as from the shore batteries; every ship in port was dressed, and Franchet d'Esperey made his official entry riding at the head of a division of troops with all the pomp and circumstance that France was able to muster. The glaring contrast between the honours paid to the two Generals was not lost on the oriental mind. Franchet d'Esperey had completely eclipsed Allenby, who left Constantinople the same afternoon, as unobtrusively as he had entered it.

CHAPTER X

PARIS 1919

IN March 12, Allenby was summoned to attend the Peace Conference in Paris, where he arrived on the 19, and put up at the Hotel Majestic which, together with its annexes, as well as the Hotel Astoria, was reserved exclusively for the British delegation. The most extravagant displays of ancient Rome paled into insignificance compared with the orgies of the Peace Conference. Pandemonium had run riot in Paris, where squander-maniacs from all over the world seemed to be holding their Olympic games. So vast was the assembly, so numerous the invaders, that the French capital was transformed into a gigantic universal fair. Each nation had commandeered the whole of at least one of the largest and most expensive hotels in the Champs Elysées for its delegates who, with armies of attendants in their train, settled down like locusts and swarmed in every direction.

The Majestic resembled a levée, a casino and a stock exchange all rolled into one. All the rooms in the hotel were occupied by Statesmen, Field Marshals, Admirals, Politicians, Diplomats, and every species of expert on every possible and impossible subject. There were advisers, foreign potantates, explorers, scientists, authors, artists, sportsmen, journalists and adventurers, besides a very representative body of wire-pullers and joy-riders. The halls, lounges and stairs were thronged with secretaries, deputies and clerks of both sexes, each of whom, in addition to their liberal salaries, incidentals and keep, had been provided with a gratuity of £15 or £20 according to sex, with which to purchase new raiment suitable to their luxurious surroundings. Press interviewers darted, with note-book and pencil from one celebrity to another, while an incessant clicking and twirling betrayed the presence of camera and cinema operators. Fleets of Government cars whirled through the streets at all hours of the day and night, to and from an uninterrupted succession of meetings, entertainments and counter-entertainments. But despite the luxury of the suites in the hotel, it was found that the prodigious mental activities of Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Balfour and Mr. Bonar Law, required the seclusion of a private retreat which was duly provided, sumptuously furnished and decorated, at 23., Rue Nitot.

Here in the seclusion of their modest £1,000 a year *garçonnière* there were no extraneous influences to restrain the Great Ones from being themselves. Lloyd George could hatch plots, confer, entertain special friends and discuss some particularly delicate situation without fear of detection, and here Balfour played his soulful Nocturnes through the sleepless nights. Political and other celebrities came and went *sans cérémonie*, while the social side of this select gathering was enlivened and embellished by the wives and daughters of distinguished delegates. At the Hotel Majestic, the crowds and the feverish activity about nothing in particular, especially the incessant hustling of lesser stars and their satellites affecting to be engaged upon momentous mission, deceived only the most unsophisticated and was extremely irritating. However, the somewhat uncongenial atmosphere of the Peace Conference was more than offset by the unprecedented gathering of remarkable people and by the subjects and problems of absorbing interest which many of them had come from all over the world to discuss and to solve, and by the truly amazing effect provided by the spectacle itself.

The administrative and political divisions inaugurated by the Entente in the northern Arab territories after the War were precisely those which Great Britain and France had envisaged under the terms of their secret Sykes–Picot Treaty, and which they fully intended to establish permanently, although this dismemberment of their country, in itself a flagrant contravention of British pledges, had been repeatedly and categorically represented to the Arabs as only temporary and in no way prejudicial to the issue upon which the Peace Conference had the sole right of decision. In order to allay Arab fears regarding the validity of Britain's pledges, the British Government had renewed the specific assurances already given to the Arabs on behalf of the Foreign Office by McMahon, Hogarth and Allenby, and had reiterated and confirmed the promises and the policy so unequivocally set out in the Anglo–French Declaration of Independence of November 7, 1918. In addition, Allenby had himself solemnly assured Feisal, who had repeatedly protested against these "provisional measures of administrative convenience," that Syria's future would be determined at the Peace Conference according to the wishes of its inhabitants, and in no other way. Allenby, however, was never guilty of misrepresentation. Being himself the embodiment of directness and the very soul of honour, he was incapable of suspecting or detecting duplicity in others and

implicitly believed in the assurances which he had been instructed to give in the name of the British Government. Moreover his own faith in the integrity of his countrymen, so clearly expressed in his tone and in his manner, effectively dispelled all misgivings and inspired confidence in others.

As a result of all these apparently genuine professions of good faith, the Emir Feisal reluctantly assented, though only provisionally, to the "temporary administrative partition of Syria" and set out for Paris to champion the Arab case for unity and independence at the Peace Conference. At Marseilles where he landed from the British cruiser *Gloucester* on November 26, 1918, Feisal made his first acquaintance with western Europe and with the stark reality of that consummate treachery which he had instinctively suspected and dreaded ever since the opening of the McMahon negotiations in 1915.

He was officially informed that the French Government regarded his visit as a purely private one and would not accord him any representative or official status. Instead of proceeding to Paris Feisal philosophically accepted an "invitation" to tour the western battlefields and then went on to England. In London, where he arrived on December 10, he was received with all the pomp and circumstance usually accorded to distinguished foreign potentates, but the pleasant dreams suddenly invoked by this ostentatious welcome were as quickly dispelled. Feisal learned that the Petrograd disclosures of which Jemal Pasha had apprised him, concerning a conspiracy among the Allies, were no "figment of a malicious Bolshevik imagination," and that the Sykes–Picot Treaty was just then the subject of a violent political brawl between Lloyd George and Clemenceau.

Lloyd George had discovered that under the terms of the Treaty, his expert adviser Sir Mark Sykes had assigned the pick of the Sultan's Asiatic dominions and the *raison d'être* of the whole campaign, namely the Vilayet of Mosul with its oil-fields, to France; and further that the Treaty exempted the administration of Palestine from that measure of British control which he was determined to secure for it. Accordingly Lloyd George wanted the Treaty cancelled on the pretext that Russia, one of the three signatories, had repudiated it. Clemenceau on the other hand maintained that it was none the less binding on the other two contracting parties. The French Government, knowing that the Treaty constituted the only proof that France's share of the spoils had been specifically recognised by Great Britain, were resolved to uphold

its validity, subject only to such qualifications as might profitably serve as a basis of exchange for reciprocal advantages elsewhere. Clemenceau whose policy was founded on the principle of *do ut des* ["tit for tat"], played a waiting game and was obdurate. Eventually Lloyd George asked Clemenceau to agree to Mosul as well as Palestine being placed under British jurisdiction in consideration of suitable compensation, including the surrender of a substantial share of the Mosul oil to France, and after a great show of “deliberation” lasting over two months, the French Government accepted the offer in a note dated February 15.

While in London Feisal who was only superficially informed of the general trend of the Anglo–French talks, was subjected to relentless pressure from the British Government to give his assent to the objects which these talks had in view. In addition to this, the Foreign Office who were hard pressed by the Zionists, and particularly anxious to face the Peace Conference with a *fait accompli*, exerted themselves insistently to induce Feisal to give his formal recognition to Zionist aspirations in Palestine. The few English “friends” including that arch-imposter T. E. Lawrence to whom Feisal turned in his extremity had already been primed by the Foreign Office and were unanimous in persuading him that he was quite safe in concluding an agreement with the Zionists, provided that agreement fully recognised the Arab claims to independence!

The Zionists on their side were equally zealous in persuading the Arab leader to subscribe to a formal agreement between himself and Chaim Weizmann in order to make that recognition final and doubly sure. At the request of the Foreign Office Feisal had received Weizmann who solemnly assured him that the Zionists had no intention whatever of establishing a Jewish hegemony in Palestine, and that their one desire was to assist in the development of the country in so far as that would be feasible without prejudice to Arab interests. The effect of all these assurances had been to allay Feisal’s misgivings and to induce him to believe that there might after all be nothing either in the Zionists’ intentions or in the British Government’s policy regarding their fulfilment that would interfere with Arab political and economic liberty in Palestine.

As was inevitable, Feisal was completely at sea. Disillusioned, bewildered, deserted by those to whom he had looked for support, with no knowledge of English or French and a stranger to European

diplomatic methods, he fell an easy prey to the onslaught directed by the combined forces of Jewry, the Foreign Office and the Quai d'Orsay. His personal sense of weakness and loneliness was aggravated by the knowledge that the French were inveterately hostile to himself and to his cause. Apart from the studied insolence to which he had been subjected on his journey through France, he had been left in no doubt as to the French Government's opposition to his nomination to the purely titular leadership of O.E.T.A. (Occupied Enemy Territory Administration). East, and further he knew that they were opposing his claim to represent his native country, the Hejaz, at the Peace Conference.

Feisal had tried hard to postpone his decision until the Peace Conference was assembled, but circumstances had made him the objective of a combined Jewish–Entente offensive and his persecutors were pressing him relentlessly for an immediate answer. The Anglo–Jewish caucus in Downing Street was bent upon forcing a decision upon the Peace Conference by compelling Feisal to commit himself in advance to a formal recognition of Zionism's pretended right to a footing in Palestine, and although he was fully alive to the danger and to the gross impropriety of their machinations he was overwhelmed by the unequal struggle and was unable to refuse. Torn between his reluctance to expose the cause to what he felt instinctively was a grave menace, and his desire to placate the British Government, be consented to endorse the Agreement, but only on condition that Great Britain fulfilled her pledges regarding Arab independence. He himself inscribed this vital stipulation on the body of the document and then signed it, but since Great Britain has failed to honour her part of the bargain she has violated the sanctity of this as of every other treaty concluded with the Arabs.

* * *

On his arrival in Paris during January 1919 Feisal discovered that the French Government had denied him the status of a delegate at the Peace Conference on the pretext that the Hejaz had not been officially recognised as an Allied belligerent state. This was too much even for the Foreign Office, at whose intervention the Quai d'Orsay climbed down and allotted the Hejaz delegation two seats at the Conference.

French hostility persisted, however, and during the whole of his three months stay in Paris, Feisal encountered the full force of the French Government's relentless determination to defeat the cause which his father and his countrymen had charged him to uphold. Seeing the hopelessness of getting a fair hearing at the Peace Conference, Feisal suggested that France and Great Britain should consult the wishes of Syria's inhabitants by holding a plebiscite on the spot, but the French Government vetoed the suggestion because they were well aware that public opinion in Syria was bitterly opposed to them. Thereupon, in the belief that the Allies really intended to govern as they had repeatedly promised, by consent of the governed, Feisal proposed that a commission of inquiry representing the U.S.A., Great Britain, France and Italy should proceed to Syria in order to ascertain the facts regarding the attitude of the people themselves towards the proposed dismemberment of their country by the Allies. This final proposal of Feisal's came at a somewhat inopportune moment and caused a certain *malaise* at the Foreign Office and the Quai d'Orsay.

After Sir Mark Sykes' last visit to Allenby's Headquarters at Bir Salem in November 1918, he hurried back to warn Lloyd George and Balfour as well as his French and Jewish colleagues of the intense bitterness which Zionism had aroused throughout Syria and Palestine, and advised them to take precautions to avert the storm which was undoubtedly gathering. Urgent as was his mission, Lloyd George's confidential Treaty-maker broke his journey in Rome in order to unburden his diplomatic soul to Cardinal Gasquet, who was thus privileged to possess some of Great Britain's most closely guarded political secrets two days before her own Prime Minister! As a result of Sykes' disclosures considerable apprehension prevailed in Entente and Zionist political circles. Prompted by his Jewish mentors Arthur Balfour went so far as to address a memorandum to the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, urging that Palestine be entirely excluded from the scope of the proposed inquiry, while Clemenceau insisted that France would consent only on consideration that the inquiry embraced Palestine and Iraq as well as Syria. By this astute stipulation Clemenceau effectively quashed Feisal's proposal and at the same time shifted the responsibility for opposing it on to Lloyd George, who, as Clemenceau had good reason to know, was well aware that an inquiry on the spot would reveal unanimous hostility to the establishment of British mandates in Palestine and Iraq. However, Lloyd George deemed it

expedient at first to make a show of supporting Feisal's proposal partly in order to keep in with President Wilson who had warmly espoused the idea from the first, and also because it was important that the Arab leader should remain hoodwinked in a fool's paradise until Allenby whose personal qualities were still unknown to Lloyd George had been tested and judged suitable or otherwise to support British policy at the Peace Conference. Specially summoned from Syria by Lloyd George, Allenby arrived in Paris on March 19. Centred in his person was the massed speculative curiosity of every charlatan at this greatest of all international political carnivals. Owing to the purely imaginary and quite fantastic religious motives attributed to his "Crusade," and to the equally nonsensical theories anent Biblical authority for his Divine mission, Allenby enjoyed a world-wide reputation for military and political wisdom unequalled by any soldier or statesman in Great Britain. Good Christians throughout the English-speaking world, and they of course included the entire populations of the British Empire and the United States, idolised and sanctified their hero, who alone among all the celebrities in Paris had the inestimable advantage of attending the Peace Conference by the Grace of God! Given favourable circumstances therefore, the value to Lloyd George of Allenby's presence and *appui* would be incalculable.

Circumstances, however, were anything but favourable. The modern *Cœur de Lion* turned out to be as direct and incorruptible as his historical prototype and predecessor, and it was evident at once that Allenby's presence not only at the Conference but in the French capital, constituted a potential danger of which the Supreme Council was anxious to be rid as quickly as possible.

On March 20, the day after Allenby's arrival in Paris, Lloyd George held a "secret" conference at his retreat in the Rue Nitot, at which President Wilson sponsored Feisal's request for the despatch to Syria and the neighbouring regions of an inter-Allied Commission of enquiry, and greatly to the satisfaction of both Allenby and Feisal, the proposal was carried unanimously. Immediately after this outrageous *mise-en-scène* ["setting of the stage"] a pretext was found to remove one who had taken his stand "upon the vantage ground of truth," to uphold right against wrong, and with unswerving loyalty to support the protagonist of a just cause.

Despite the presence in Egypt of 60,000 able-bodied war veterans and every conceivable kind of artillery on the ground and in the air, the

whole of the Nile Basin was in the throes of anarchy, and Cairo itself had actually been isolated for two days by bands of abject craven hooligans, students and Azharites, many of them little more than children. Here then was a heaven sent opportunity which lesser political jugglers than Lloyd George would not have allowed to pass. Barely three days after his arrival and on the day following the spurious conference in the Rue Nitot, Allenby's visit to Paris was "cut short by the news of a general rising in Egypt," whither he was hurriedly sent as Special or Temporary High Commissioner.

Leaving Paris on March 21, he arrived at Marseilles the next day and immediately embarked on H.M.'s destroyer *Steadfast* which sailed at 5.15 p.m. Despite rough seas and a strong wind, the *Steadfast* maintained a steady 30 knots until 8.30 a.m. on the 23rd, when she slowed down to 22 knots. Being a brand new ship on her maiden voyage the *Steadfast* had not "rusted up," and consequently a certain amount of water got into her oil tanks necessitating the slowing down of her engines. Later in the day she further decreased speed to 20 knots and reached Malta at 9.30 p.m. somewhat shaken after the heavy going, and at 9.40 went alongside H.M.'s light cruiser *Caradoc* which was waiting with steam up.

Allenby at once transferred to the cruiser which sailed twenty minutes later at 10 p.m. and maintained an average speed of 24 knots in a calm sea. At 8.30 a.m. on the 25th, she eased down to lower her paravanes and entered Alexandria harbour at 10 a.m. completing the journey from Marseilles in 64¾ hours. At 3.30 p.m. on the same day Allenby arrived in Cairo and took up his duties at the Residency.

On that very day and almost at the same hour, a meeting of the Supreme Council was held in Paris at which the proposal carried at the farcical conference on the 20th, was formally adopted, and President Wilson's amendments approved. To complete the hoax it was decided that each of the four Powers should appoint two representatives to serve on the Commission, and while Clemenceau did not deign even to make a show of selecting the French pair, it is significant to say the least, that the "impartial judges" secretly chosen to represent Great Britain were none other than our old friends Sir Henry McMahon and Commander D. G. Hogarth!

Completely taken in by the ostentatious professions of good faith contained in the officially censored reports emanating from the Council Chamber, and overjoyed at the apparently propitious turn of events,

Feisal decided to leave well alone and set out for Damascus, there to await the coming of the Allied Commission of inquiry. With both Allenby and Feisal thus safely out of the way the Supreme Council were free to proceed with the settlement of the Eastern question according to the dictates of their own political whims, with the result that the much discussed Commission of inquiry never materialised. The scheme was gradually whittled down under pressure from the Quai d'Orsay until nothing of Feisal's original proposal remained. The British Government who were opposed to Clemenceaun's stipulation extending the inquiry to their own spheres in Palestine and Iraq, gladly availed themselves of Franco–Jewish hostility to the whole scheme as a pretext for backing out themselves. A Commission did eventually go but its two members were both Americans whose report was pigeon-holed for three years by the Supreme Council and then entirely ignored.

In view of the fact that Feisal's proposal to send an Allied Commission of inquiry to Syria had appealed so strongly to President Wilson from the first, it's ignominious fate at the hands of the Peace Conference has remained totally inexplicable to the Arabs ever since. The whole history of this particular event, however is characteristic of the Four and aptly expresses the feelings of the three European members of the Council for their American colleague. That Wilson lacked political sagacity has been proved by his own statements and not least by the almost incredible suggestion he made in October 1918 to the French Minister Jusserand, namely that the territory to be taken from Turkey should be governed by some of the south American States, AS OTHERWISE THE LATTER WOULD HAVE NO OPPORTUNITY OF GAINING EXPERIENCE IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS! The man who made that remark lacked not only political sagacity but common sense. Woodrow Wilson was a mediocrity; at best he was only a cipher. He was pitchforked into the White House by the Jewish politico-financial caucus which governs America, and thrown out again by them as soon as he had served their purpose. His person, no less than his rigid and undeveloped mentality made him an ideal mask or stalking horse, characteristics of which the men behind the Presidential Chair took full advantage.

Wilson's English prototype was Arthur Balfour, whose prestige and reputation for political integrity made him what he undoubtedly was, the perfect figurehead. As an official spokesman he was invaluable. Balfour's sonorous platitudes in the House of Commons or out of it

could be relied upon to give an appearance of undoubted veracity to what was in fact fraudulent misrepresentation. To wit his perorations in Parliament in defence of the Government's expenditure on armaments in the United States during the War. Great Britain was piling up debts in America for munitions and supplies of which an alarming percentage was both defective and deficient. So dependent, however, was England on the U.S. that the Government dared not refuse or even complain about the "dud" ammunition and faulty or deficient supplies, for which they were being so scandalously overcharged. In order to hoodwink Parliament and the Press the Cabinet created a Purchase Control Board presided over by Balfour, whose duty it was to control by scrutinising, and where necessary to cut, all invoices for U.S. war supplies. It was obviously impossible for them to scrutinise too closely, but excess charges were invariably cut by a simple device whereby an already grossly overloaded bill amounting to say £500,000 was inflated by arrangement to £750,000 before it left the U.S. and subsequently cut down again by the British Control Board to £550,000, the extra £50,000 being divided equally (round the corner) between the American exporting firm and members of the Control Board. Whereupon Balfour as President of the Board would make an official pronouncement to the effect that his inquisitorial committee had reduced an American bill for munitions from £750,000 to £550,000, thereby saving the Treasury £200,000, Balfour himself being, presumably, unaware that his own inquisitors had netted £25,000 on a single deal!

Clemenceau made no secret of his contempt for President Wilson. At the Peace Conference he treated him with studied insolence, affecting to fall asleep while the President was speaking, and waking up at the end of the speech he would ignore Wilson's statement altogether and merely reaffirm what he himself had said prior to the President's pronouncement, and then resume his slumbers. Although Lloyd George's personal feelings for Wilson were akin to those of Clemenceau, he found it expedient on nearly every occasion to humour the President and side with him purely in order to impress the French with the fundamental unity of the English-speaking delegations. But in 1919, "the French" meant simply Clemenceau, and he was far too old a bird to be impressed by the cumbersome antics executed by Lloyd George in the course of his political equilibrations.

The fourth member of the Supreme Council was the Jew Sonnino, who stood aloof and kept watch and ward on the fringe of the debates ready to pounce the instant any of the others made a *faux pas*. As Wilson was merely a figurehead, and Sonnino more of a pirate than a collaborator, the Four became Two, Clemenceau and Lloyd George, of whom the former completely dominated his nimblewitted adversary and colleague.

But Clemenceau and Lloyd George were far from being the autocrats they were generally supposed to be. The Supreme Council itself was not the executive of the Peace Conference, but only a puppet show manipulated from behind by the Supreme Sanhedrim of World Jewry. Apart from Sonnino, the three gentile members of the Council were closely watched and primed by their Jewish secretariats. Clemenceau was an inveterate Judophile. As a journalist he had championed and whitewashed the notorious Jew Capitaine Alfred Dreyfus. As Premier during the war, and in face of considerable opposition he appointed the Jew Klotz to be his Finance Minister. Paul Clemenceau had married a Jewess, the daughter of Moritz Szeps, the well-known Left Wing editor of the *Neues Wiener Tageblatt*, and to complete the picture, the Prime Minister's secretariat was presided over by a scion of the Rothschilds.

As to Lloyd George whose Jewish antecedents have already been dealt with at length, his principal private secretary was the Jew Sir Philip Sassoon, while Woodrow Wilson was as we have seen, merely the mouthpiece of his Jewish mentors.

With Allenby and Feisal pacified and out of the way, Clemenceau was free to concentrate upon the realisation of his ambitions in Syria. He began by informing the Peace Conference that small countries would take no part in its deliberations. The fate therefore of Syria and the like, was to be decided by the Supreme Council who would inform the lesser delegates what and where to sign. Refusal to append their signatures to the edicts of the Triumvirate made no difference to the validity of those edicts which did not require the approbation of those whose obedience they prescribed to make them legal, in fact the Supreme Council could dictate to the world much as the Holy Alliance had dictated to Europe over a century earlier.

On first hearing of President Wilson's famous Fourteen Points Clemenceau exclaimed: *Et dire que le Bon Dieu lui-même n'en avait que dix!*[6] Had the significance of that caustic remark dawned upon Feisal he might have seen through Wilson's disasterous peace policy

while there was yet time to save something from the wreck, but circumstances no less than his enemies and even his supposed friends were against him, and he was alone. Had a single one of his numerous counsellors been willing and able to enlighten, he might have realised that despite, or rather because of all the brave talk about the rights of small nations and self determination, the soundest advice ever given to the ruler of a minor state was La Fontaine's:—

Petits princes, videz vos débats entre vous;
De recouriy aux rois vous seriez de grands fous,
Il ne faut jemais les engager dans vos guerres,
Ni les faire entrer sur vos terres. [7]

* * *

On his arrival in Damascus at the beginning of May after an absence in Europe of over four months, Feisal found that general unrest and smouldering disaffection prevailed throughout the country. The political situation was causing him considerable anxiety, especially as owing to a growing apprehension regarding their future the population was getting out of hand. A few days previously Allenby had left Egypt to proceed on a tour of inspection in Syria and his arrival in Damascus coincided with that of Feisal. Allenby's presence was always a powerful factor in maintaining order and preserving peace, considerations which Feisal fully appreciated but of which the advantages were offset by the fact that officially at least, Allenby's presence in Damascus did not presage British support for the Arabs against France or even against the unruly elements of Feisal's own subjects, but on the contrary it was a token of Anglo–French solidarity and of the British Government's determination to uphold French authority in Syria.

As Commander-in-Chief in the Near East Allenby could enforce his authority through the French as well as through any other Allied subordinate command, and in opposing French decrees therefore the Arabs were defying the supreme military authority of which Allenby was the head, a fact which at the repeated urgent request of the French themselves, and much against his own inclination, Allenby was continually having to impress upon the Arabs, who however, paid very little heed to his admonitions.

In spite of his strenuous efforts, Feisal could do nothing to stem the tide of restlessness and sullen resentment which was rising throughout

the country and which came to a head when the secret political party which was organising national resistance to foreign intervention, came into the open and showed its hand. By this time Feisal had completely lost control, and became a mere figurehead at patriotic and monarchical demonstrations. Having taken matters into its own hands, a body known as the National Assembly met openly for the first time in Damascus on July 2, 1919 and styled itself the General Syrian Congress. It was a representative body whose members were drawn from every part of Syria, though some of the delegates elected in constituencies under French occupation had been prevented from attending the opening conference in Damascus. At their inaugural meeting the General Congress passed resolutions demanding:—

1. Recognition of the independence of Syria with Palestine, as a single sovereign State with Feisal as King, and recognition of the independence of Iraq.

2. The repudiation of the Sykes–Picot Treaty and the Balfour Declaration, and of any and every other scheme for the partitioning of Syria or for the creation of a Jewish hegemony in Palestine.

3. Disavowal of the Anglo–French Mandatory system while accepting a limited form of foreign collaboration for preference American, and failing that, British.

4. The refusal of French patronage or collaboration in any form.

Alarmed for their own safety in view of the growing hostility of the Syrians, the French military authorities had again appealed to Allenby who once more proceeded to Damascus and himself peremptorily demanded immediate submission to France's representative in the person of Colonel Cousse.

But Allenby's prestige had suffered as a result of his Government's repeated violation of its pledges, while Feisal's popularity and authority had been eclipsed by the General Congress whose violently national and anti-French policy was sweeping an already over excited country to the brink of revolution.

* * *

At the Peace Conference meanwhile, Anglo–French relations over the Near Eastern question had become strained to breaking point. Whether in order to bring matters to a head, French political agents in Damascus had been fanning the smouldering passions of the Syrian

populace is uncertain, but there is no question whatever regarding the motive which precipitated the crisis in Paris. A campaign let loose and conducted by Clemenceau's political minions had stirred up a considerable section of French public opinion which was still further inflamed by the scurrilous denunciations in the press of "England's nefarious intrigues in Syria." According to the officially inspired French newspapers Great Britain was trying to evade her commitments under the Sykes–Picot Treaty by inciting the Arabs to contest French "rights" in Syria. Satisfied with this *mise-en-scène* ["setting of the stage"] expressly engineered by him to provide an ideal setting for another of his spectacular coups, Clemenceau sat back and waited. The initiative now lay with Lloyd George who responded at once by anticipating the French Premier's next move. Under the terms of the Sykes–Picot Treaty the crafty Picot had annexed Mosul for France who retained it against the day when she could score by its exchange. That day had arrived, and Clemenceau was ready now to give Mosul, which he did not require, in exchange for Syria which France would have gone to any lengths to possess.

The French Government had been explicit in stating their case which was inexorable. Their "rights" to a protectorate in Syria they asserted, were founded on age-old tradition and were incontestable, and moreover in their view, Anglo–French amity depended entirely upon the immediate recognition by Great Britain of those "rights." Having decided at once that there was no alternative, Lloyd George made an offer to Clemenceau which was designed not only to satisfy France but also to reduce the formidable cost of maintaining the British army of occupation in Syria. In effect Lloyd George proposed that the British garrisons in Syria and Cilicia should be withdrawn and relieved as to Cilicia and Western Syria by French troops, but in Eastern Syria by Arab forces, who thanks to this last proviso, automatically retained the exclusive right to garrison Damascus and Aleppo. The stipulation permitting the Arabs to remain in occupation of their own towns in Eastern Syria was inserted by Lloyd George (Clemenceau conniving) with the deliberate intention of deceiving Feisal, and incidentally, on Clemenceau's part, of allowing Lloyd George to save face with French permission, as it was feared in England that the immediate and complete evacuation of the whole of Syria by Great Britain, to the exclusive advantage of France, might severely injure British prestige throughout the East.

It cannot be too emphatically stated that Lloyd George had definitely decided to give Clemenceau a free hand throughout the entire area allotted to France under the terms of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, but that he had purposely delayed withdrawing the British garrisons until their departure could be effected in exchange for the inclusion of Mosul in the British area, subject to France receiving half the output of the Mosul oil wells. To give the proceedings a semblance of integrity it was decided to invite both Allenby and Feisal "to assist at the deliberations of the Peace Conference," but the invitation omitted to mention the character of those particular "deliberations" at which their presence was desired.

Accordingly Allenby sailed from Egypt on September 5, and arrived on Paris on the 9th. He was received at the Gare de Lyon in the name of the French Government by Georges Picot, the French High Commissioner for Syria. On the very next day, the 10th, he left Paris to be the guest of Lloyd George at Deauville whither the harassed Prime Minister had retired with the avowed object of transacting urgent affairs of State away from the importunities and interruptions of the Hotel Majestic and the Rue Nitot. Lloyd George himself occupied a well appointed villa standing in its own grounds on the wooded slopes just outside and overlooking the town. In the Prime Minister's personal entourage at the villa were Sir Auckland Geddes, Sir Maurice Hankey, Lord Riddle and Sir Robert (now Viscount) Horne, Miss Law (daughter of Bonar Law) and his private secretaries Miss Stevenson, Mr. Philip Kerr (now Marquess of Lothian) and Mr. (afterwards Sir John) Davies. "In attendance" also was the distinguished portrait painter Augustus John.

Lord Allenby and his staff, consisting of General Sir John Shea and Captain R. G. Borthwick were accommodated in separate suites at the Hotel Normandie near by. A return, however fleeting, to the spacious serenity of pre-war luxury was an ideal which no one in Allenby's party had experienced since 1914, and the ensuing five days passed all too quickly amidst pleasant surroundings in perfect weather. After breakfast the older men would read their papers or admire the view from the terrace while Lloyd George sat for his portrait to Mr. Augustus John, and the younger members of the party, with the ladies, motored into Deauville for bathing or tennis. A variety of entertainments in and out of doors, with gatherings for tea and later for cocktails spanned the afternoons, while the evenings which opened with dinner parties at the

Casino or the Normandie, grew into nights with dancing, suppers and general merry-making until the small hours.

Lloyd George, Lord Riddle, Sir Auckland Geddes and Lady Astor were always to the fore and enjoyed themselves as much as their juniors. Prices were abnormally high, and the cost of entertaining even a few guests and their servants was terrific. At the Normandie, a small room under the eaves without any extras, even a cup of coffee, cost £5 a night and cocktails were 6 francs at par. But Mr. Lloyd George was the perfect host and his Keeper of the Privy Purse. Mr. Philip Kerr, settled all the bills *en grand seigneur*. This happy carefree party broke up on the 15th when the Prime Minister left for Paris to attend a meeting of the Supreme Council specially convened on that day in order to hear his official statement regarding the evacuation of Syria by Great Britain, the conditions of which had already been settled privately between himself and Clemenceau, who of course readily assented to Lloyd George's formal proposal, but only in so far as it made provision for the substitution of French for British troops, to the exclusion of the Arabs and on the explicit understanding that his consent was given without prejudice to the final settlement of Anglo–French delimitations in Syria under the terms of the Sykes–Picot Treaty. Further it was agreed that the withdrawal of the British garrisons should commence on November 1. During Allenby's visit to France and the days immediately preceding the session of the Supreme Council on September 15, the French Press were clamouring for the substitution of French for British troops in Syria and for the handing over of the country to France. The newspapers stated quite openly that although they were pleased to receive Allenby in France, his visit was absolutely pointless unless it were made with the avowed intention of settling the Syrian question once and for all in France's favour. "To do this" the papers asserted, "the British must conform to the terms of the Anglo–French Agreement of 1916 by retiring at once and handing over Syria with Damascus to France." On the whole, the press were distinctly unfriendly to Allenby of whom the best they could find to say was, in the words of the *Petit Parisien*, that in appearance he resembled a gentleman farmer!

Being incorruptible, Allenby was the *bête noire* of Weizmann and his Jews, moreover his unswerving loyalty to the pledges given in all good faith by him to Feisal, made him an obstacle to French ambitions in Syria and therefore obnoxious to Clemenceau and to Georges Picot and their Jew-ridden political *confréres*.

While staying with the British Prime Minister at Deauville, Allenby had been informed of the private arrangement between Lloyd George and Clemenceau which stipulated for the retention of Eastern Syria by Feisal's army, but at the time of the official sitting of the Supreme Council in Paris on September 15, at which it was decided to bar Arab troops from Syria altogether, Allenby was already on his way to England where he was not due until the following day, but so anxious was Lloyd George to speed his parting guest, that rather than have him in Paris he arranged that Allenby should leave at once for Boulogne, where he spent the night of the 15th before proceeding to Dover by destroyer at 10-15 a.m. on the 16th.

The Clemenceau–George plan had succeeded at England's expense. France was now master of Syria, and French ambition was becoming a menace to Palestine and Iraq where Great Britain's position was still undefined and correspondingly insecure. The final scramble for Damascus, after the victory of Megiddo in September 1918, had been an Anglo–Arab race not against shattered Ottoman troops, but against France; a race won, and subsequently lost. French subversive influence was throwing Britain more and more into the hands of the Jews who were the masters of France and of the Supreme Council at Versailles. Israel Blumchen puts the case quite plainly in his *Le Droit de la Race Supérieure* when he says:—

"Contemporary French history is nothing but the history of the conquest of France by Israel. At last the Jewish people are the masters of France, and we Jews reign over the French by virtue of the right of a superior over an inferior race. From the socialist Jaurés to the radical Clemenceau, there is not a politician fat or lean, who is not in our pay, and we watch over them all through their Jewish secretaries."

The ascendency of the Jews was closely connected with the great victory of Rome. The Vatican's power had been growing steadily all over the world but Principally in France under the spell of Foch, and was greatly stimulated by the prominence given to the Holy Land during Allenby's campaign, especially by the eclipse of Orthodox Russia as a temporal and spiritual power in Palestine, where Rome and Juda were now supreme. Never had the Pope stood higher in the eyes of his subjects than on that day after the War when in answer to Allenby's appeal for assistance, a Cardinal arrived at General-Headquarters in Haifa and by his presence immediately restored the waning prestige and authority of the British Commander in Chief!

* * *

Meanwhile the second of Lloyd George's guests had answered the summons to attend the "deliberations of the Peace Conference." Feisal reached London on September 19, four days after the fateful meeting in Paris of the Supreme Council at which the destiny of Syria was finally settled and which both he and Allenby had been specially invited to attend. He had come to be consulted but was faced on arrival with a *fait accompli*. The Prime Minister curtly informed him of what had taken place in Paris, but mendaciously substituted the spurious agreement concluded privately between himself and Clemenceau for the actual treaty concluded by the Supreme Council on the 15th. Even so, Feisal was horrified and remonstrated with Lloyd George, whose plan for the occupation of Western Syria by French troops he denounced as outrageous, little suspecting how infinitely worse was to be his fate under the terms of the treaty concluded on the 15th. During the following days three conferences on the Syrian question were held at 10, Downing Street between Feisal, Lloyd George and Lord Curzon the Foreign Secretary, at which Allenby was present. But once again the politicians decided that Feisal was more tractable without Allenby at his back, and so the conference held at No. 10 on September 23, was the last to be attended by the Field Marshal, who on the following day, September 24, left London for Scotland where he was to spend three days as the guest of King George V at Balmoral, before proceeding to his brother's home at Berwick-on-Tweed.

During the visit to Balmoral there occurred an incident of considerable interest which it is relevant to recall now. One night after dinner, the ladies having withdrawn, there remained sitting round the dining room table the King, the Duke of York, Prince Henry, Admiral Campbell, Colonel Clive Wigram and Captain R. Borthwick. On either side of his Majesty sat the Marquis de Soveral and Lord Revelstoke, while right opposite was Allenby. The conversation had been general for some time, when suddenly the King asked Allenby what was being done with regard to the German Institute on the Mount of Olives. "The German Emperor himself took a great interest in the design and construction of the building" said His Majesty, "and put himself to no end of trouble over it, and now they're going to let the Jews have it." The significance of those words, spoken with great fervour, was quite unmistakable, the more so as the King raised his eyes and threw up his

hands in an eloquent gesture of profound disgust. Allenby, who held the view that Judaism and Bolshevism were synonymous, made no reply. “Don’t you allow it,” pursued the King. “I’ll do my best Sire” said Allenby, knowing full well that he could do nothing. To which the King retorted sharply “No. No. That won't do; they MUST’NT have it.”

* * *

Though deserted by every one of his so-called friends and supporters Feisal made a determined stand against the proposed withdrawal of the British garrisons from Western Syria in favour of French troops, and addressed a formal protest to the Prime Minister. He was of course still unaware of the Supreme Council’s decision to allow France to occupy the whole of Syria. He reminded Lloyd George that it was only after receiving Allenby’s solemn assurance that Syria would remain in the occupation of British troops until a final settlement by the Peace Conference, that he had consented to withdraw his forces to the interior. He protested vehemently against the proposed invasion of his country by France and against the suggestion that such an event was the inevitable and logical outcome of the Sykes–Picot Treaty, to which conspiracy neither he nor his had been accessories, and to which the Arabs had always been strongly averse. He implored the British Government to honour the pledges given by them in the “Declaration to the Seven” of June 16, 1918, and in the “Anglo–French Declaration” of November 1918, and having informed them of his inability to comply with their project he begged them to convene a meeting of representatives from Great Britain, France and the U.S.A. to settle the destiny of the Arabs on the basis of the pledges given by those countries themselves. Knowing Feisal’s case to be unanswerable, but having themselves already secretly handed over the whole of Syria to the French, the British Government were anxious to close this embarrassing and now quite pointless exchange of diplomatic notes. Having left Feisal under the false impression that they were considering his request for a Conference of the Powers, they put him in direct, communication with Clemenceau, hoping that a Franco–Arab understanding would relieve them of all further trouble. Accordingly Feisal went to Paris where he was immediately taken in hand by the Quai d’Orsay. The result was a foregone conclusion. At a meeting with Clemenceau on November 27, Feisal agreed not to

oppose the occupation by French troops of the Lebanon and the maritime regions of Syria while Clemenceau for his part solemnly promised that the French occupation would be confined to the area stated, and would not infringe on the eastern territories reserved to the Arabs. In order to make this provision doubly sure and to obviate any possibility of a clash between the two armies, the French Premier went so far as to deliminate a neutral zone separating the French and Arab areas.

Like all similar subterfuges this treaty was invalidated by a clause subjecting it to final ratification by the Peace Conference. Feisal was induced to believe that this compromise with France was the only alternative to an open breach with the Entente and moreover he flattered himself that it was only a provisional arrangement which Great Britain would assist him to modify considerably when the Syrian question came up for final settlement at the Peace Conference. It had apparently not yet dawned on Feisal that the Peace Conference was merely a euphemism for the Supreme Council, which in turn was the joint pseudonym of Clemenceau and Lloyd George.

As Feisal had once remained in Syria pending the arrival of the inter-Allied Commission of inquiry which never came, so now he tarried in Europe fondly believing that the Supreme Council was about to convene a “Conference of the Powers,” and while thus vainly expectant, he tried to keep in touch with affairs at home by maintaining uninterrupted communication with his younger brother Said who was acting for him at Damascus.

Preparations for the withdrawal of the British garrisons from the Lebanon and the maritime regions of Syria, began as agreed between Clemenceau and Lloyd George, during the first week in November, and this retirement was regarded by the inhabitants as presaging the permanent occupation of that particular part of the country by France, against whom and Feisal, outraged public opinion began to express itself in rioting and general disorders. Coinciding with the commencement of the British evacuation was the appointment of the French General Gouraud to be Commander-in-Chief in Syria, an event which was succeeded by another of far greater moment, and of which Gouraud’s nomination was only the prelude.

On the morning of November 26, His Majesty’s light cruiser *Ceres* steamed out of Alexandria harbour and headed straight for Beirut. On board was Lord Allenby accompanied by his Chief of Staff General Sir

Louis Bols, Brigadier General Wavell (now Lieut. General Sir Archibald Wavell, General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Middle East), Captain R. Borthwick and the French liaison officer Colonel de Meru. Allenby arrived at Beirut early on the following morning the 27th, and was received in the name of the French Government by General Gouraud. The ceremonies which marked the official reception were worthy of the momentous occasion, which was a turning point in the history of Syria. After the usual preliminaries, the cortége drove from the quay through the town to General Headquarters. Here in the presence of the assembled French and British Staffs and of Arab representatives, Allenby formally recognised the supreme sovereignty of France over the whole of Syria, and at the same time relinquished all his powers as Commander-in-Chief, both civil and military, to General Gouraud who received them on behalf of the French Government. The "handing over" ceremony was followed by luncheon at the Villa Sursock, Gouraud's official residence situated just outside the town, and that same afternoon Allenby boarded the cruiser *Ceres* and sailed at once for Port Said. Just as he was taking leave of Gouraud and his Staff prior to embarking, a young Arab officer came running up and made a last impassioned appeal to Allenby. The French officers present were obviously embarrassed and considerably annoyed. "*Qu'est-ce qu'il veut ce Bédouin?*" said Colonel de Meru to a British officer standing beside him, but only the interpreter had understood the Arab who was quietly hustled out of the way. Allenby took no further notice of the incident and embarked without knowing why or by whom he had been thus addressed. Simultaneously with the handing over of Syria to France on November 27, Gouraud was made High Commissioner for all the territories under French mandate.

That the British Government were determined to prevent the facts relating to this episode from becoming generally known, is proved by the following drastically censored and belated statement which appeared in the "Times" of December 2, 1919:—

"Allenby Visits Gouraud."

Cairo, November 28, (delayed).

"Lord Allenby returned here today from a flying visit by cruiser to Beirut where he met General Gouraud, the French High Commissioner for Syria."

In Paris on that same day, November 27, at a meeting with Clemenceau, Feisal, who knew nothing of what was happening at Beirut, agreed to allow the occupation by French troops of THE LEBANON AND THE MARITIME REGIONS OF SYRIA ONLY, while Clemenceau solemnly promised that the French occupation would be confined to the area stipulated and would not infringe on the eastern territories reserved to the Arabs.

* * *

In Syria the substitution of French for British troops very soon led to hostile demonstrations, general disorder and open rebellion, and even to clashes between French and Arab forces. Feisal returned hurriedly to restore order and also to procure a mandate from the National Congress empowering him to pursue his negotiations with the Supreme Council in Paris. He was still unaware that the French occupation had been officially and irrevocably sanctioned by the British Government. He arrived in Beirut early in January 1920 and visited Damascus and Aleppo, at both of which places he was coldly received. In vain did he plead and argue that his agreement with Clemenceau was not final but only a makeshift. It was all to no purpose. In the eyes of his countrymen Feisal had capitulated to France, and although they were still prepared to accept him as their King, they were fully determined to take the law into their own hands and put their house in order themselves.

On March 8, the National Congress assembled in Damascus and proclaimed Syria as a whole, including its maritime regions, the Lebanon and Palestine an independent sovereign state under its own constitutional Monarchy, the Emir Feisal. But as Syria, Palestine and Iraq were then under Franco–British occupation, resolutions expressing the popular will of people already in bondage could serve no practical purpose. That the authors of the Anglo–French and the Balfour Declarations were never in any doubt as to Arab national aspirations is proved by their implacable hostility to any form of plebiscite and even to an impartial commission of investigation, wherever they knew the consensus of public opinion to be dead against them. Had the Governments of Great Britain and France fulfilled their promises and carried out the precepts of their own Declarations, there would have been no occasion for any manifestation of popular antagonism. But despite their solemn assurances to the contrary, according to the terms

of the Lloyd George–Clemenceau agreement ratified by the Supreme Council on September 15, and finally confirmed at Beirut on November 27, 1919 by Allenby and Gouraud, Great Britain formally recognised a French hegemony in Syria in return for a similar recognition by France of British protectorates for Iraq and Palestine. It was hardly to be expected therefore that Entente designs on the Arab countries would be deflected by a resolution of the Syrian National Congress. On the contrary, they denounced the steps taken at Damascus on March 8 by the National Congress, the validity of which they refused to recognise, and called a meeting of the Supreme Council which took place at San Remo on April 25, 1920.

As there was nothing further to be gained by dissimulation, the Supreme Council decided for the first time to show its hand by announcing its decision to carve up the Arab Provinces of the late Ottoman Empire according to the provisions of the Sykes–Picot Treaty. Syria and the Lebanon were to be united under a single mandate allotted to France while Great Britain was to receive two mandates, one for Iraq and another for Palestine, the terms of the latter obliging the Mandatary to enforce the provisions of the Balfour Declaration. If anything still survived of Arab faith in the integrity of Western diplomacy that fallacious illusion received a shattering blow when the judgement delivered at San Remo was promulgated on May 5, 1920. At last it dawned upon the Arabs that they had been betrayed. By their decisions at San Remo the Allies had openly proclaimed their intention of deliberately breaking their pledges, of repudiating their obligations, and of violating the fundamental principles of justice. From now on there could be no friendly or even peaceful relations between betrayers and betrayed.

The mandate enabled French officialdom to deal summarily with Feisal who, rather than accede to the clamours of his followers for war against France, preferred to return to Europe in the hope of securing a fair hearing before an Anglo–French tribunal. But his projected voyage was cut short by an ultimatum from General Gouraud received on July 14. This ultimatum, with which he was ordered to comply within four days, stipulated for:—

The handing over to French military control of the main strategical railway, which automatically entailed the presence of French troops in all the towns along that railway including Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo.

The abolition of conscription and reduction of the standing army.

The unqualified recognition of the French Mandate.

The adoption of the currency system imposed by the French administration, and the punishment of anyone implicated in acts of anti-French hostility.

As France was in any case about to extend the area of her military occupation so as to include the rest of Syria, Gouraud's communication was merely a tactical smoke-screen. To the consternation of his supporters Feisal accepted the ultimatum in toto and unconditionally. In view of Gouraud's obvious determination, Feisal realised that a rejection of the terms would merely serve as an excuse for the occupation of Damascus by French troops, and that his best plan was to yield at once to *force majeure* and then repair immediately to London where he hoped to get a fair and impartial hearing. His illusions regarding the fundamental rectitude of British statesmen, though greatly attenuated, were sufficient to influence his policy which was still further inclined to pacifism by a telegram from Lord Curzon bidding him at all costs to avoid hostilities.

Having formally accepted Gouraud's ultimatum, Feisal immediately started to comply with its terms. He had already demobilised the greater part of the forces garrisoning Damascus when the French columns began to converge on the city. At the first news of the threat to their capital the whole population rose to defend it. Their action was entirely spontaneous and in contravention of the orders given by Feisal whose determination to enforce the conditions which he had accepted, is proved by the fact that the measures to which he had recourse in restoring order, cost the lives of more than a hundred of his followers shot down in the streets of Damascus by his own police. Many more were killed in heroic attempts to hold up the invaders whose overwhelming armaments and numbers, however, quickly overcame all resistance, and on July 24, only ten days after the presentation of Gouraud's ultimatum, the French columns entered Damascus. Feisal's capital was seized as the result of a concerted plan conceived and executed by Great Britain and France in close cooperation throughout. Gouraud's first official act on entering Damascus was to order Feisal out of the country, with the result that Great Britain's faithful Ally was banished to Italy where he remained in exile until he was summoned to London by the British Government who hoped to overcome the hostility

of the Iraqi Arabs to British rule by calling the Protectorate a Kingdom and appointing the Emir Feisal to be its first Sovereign.

ENDNOTES

[←1]

Editor's note: Sublime Porte, also called Porte, the government of the Ottoman Empire. The name is a French translation of Turkish Bâbıâli (“High Gate,” or “Gate of the Eminent”).

[←2]

Editor's note: At number 37 Quai d’Orsay in Paris, stands the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The street name is used in the text throughout to denote this ministry.

[←3]
Editor's translation: *The real way to be deceived is to think you are better than others.*

[←4]
The part of Syria west of the districts of Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo which, McMahon averred on October 24, must be excluded because they were not purely Arab, but according to the same authority on December 13, solely because French interests were involved.

[←5]

Editor's note: After the peak of Ottoman rule under Süleyman the Magnificent in the 16th century, the Ottoman Empire struggled to maintain its bloated bureaucracy and decentralized political structure. Russian Emperor Nicholas I is considered to be the first to use the term "Sick Man" to describe the Ottoman Empire in the mid-19th century.

[←6]

Editor's translation: *And to think that the Good Lord himself had only ten!*

[←7]

Editor's translation: *Little princes, empty your debates among yourselves; To resort to kings you would be great fools, You must never engage them in your wars, Nor let them enter your lands.*

About this eBook

This unabridged digital edition has been created from a scan uploaded by user *archivistchp* on the Internet Archive:

ark:/13960/s2ftq9ct62t

The text has been produced using optical character recognition (OCR), which can be prone to errors. Words that were hyphenated for line-breaks in the original text have been re-joined using search-and-replace techniques. Next, the text has then been proof-read, and italicization re-added by hand. For these reasons, there may be some minor spelling or formatting differences between the text in this digital version and the physical book.

Additionally, this book was written in 1939 by an Englishman, so some alternate spellings are present. The main purpose of this digital edition is to preserve the original text so only minor edits have been made. All changes have been made to increase the readability of the material. For instance, there are a few cases where the spelling in the original is clearly a mistake; those cases have subsequently been corrected. The complete list of (known) changes to the source text is listed below:

- "Plenipotentaries" (p. 9)
- "ans" (p. 32)
- "subserviance" (p. 39)
- "nearling" (p. 49)
- "posessibly" (p. 59)
- "valied" (p. 69)
- "notarious" (p. 76)
- "ultimmate" (p. 88)
- "phenominal" (p. 93)
- "estemmed" (p. 96)
- "Schmatryar" (p. 100)
- "liviliest" (p. 122)
- "betreated" (p. 125)
- "loigarchy" (p. 139)
- "Ashkenasi" (p. 155)

- "powerfull" (p. 161)

Hyphens changed to en-dashes where appropriate.

Slight modification of punctuation. (pp. 4, 8, 66, 89, 117, 132, 135, 158).

Explanatory notes added in square brackets (pp. 10, 50, 51, 52, 59, 74, 75, 117, 149, 173).

Lastly, the book's only footnote (p. 85) has been moved to the end of the book, with additional explanatory notes added for context.

This eBook is dedicated to Mike Peinovich, for your tireless fight against the Jews.

v1.2